UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

ARTHUR WESLEY FERGUSON

A THESIS

IN EDUCATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PHILADELPHIA

1925

PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

A THESIS

IN EDUCATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ARTHUR WESLEY FERGUSON

Reprint from

Bulletin 1925, No. 17,
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education

PHILADELPHIA

1925

FOREWORD

The author gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to Professors Harlan Updegraff and LeRoy A. King, under whose inspiration and guidance this study developed. Members of the seminar in Educational Administration during the years 1922-24, also contributed largely to its development.

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF EDUCATION

BULLETIN, 1925, No. 17

PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

By

ARTHUR WESLEY FERGUSON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, SWARTHMORE, PA.

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1925

ADDITIONAL COPIES
OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
AT
10 CENTS PER COPY

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I. Introduction	1
Chapter II. Growth and development of State departments of education since 1900	4
Growth in personnel	4
Functional development	7
Rise in cost	9
Chapter III. Organization and functions of the department of education in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	13
Brief survey	13
Organization of the Massachusetts Department of Education	15
Organization of the Connecticut Department of Education	16
Organization of the New York Department of Education	17
Organization of the New Jersey Department of Education	17
Organization of the Pennsylvania Department of Education	17
The work of the several divisions, Massachusetts Department	18
The work of the several divisions, Connecticut Department	20
The work of the several divisions of the New York Department	23
The work of the several divisions of the New Jersey Department	24
The work of the several divisions of the Pennsylvania Department	27
Chapter IV. The professional staff officer	31
Appointment	31
Qualifications	32
Term	32
Age	33
Education	35
Prior position	36
Tenure	36
Salary	39
Chapter V. The staff at work	41
Office work	41
Field work	44
Chapter VI. Summary and conclusions	55
Summary	55
The professional staff officer	55
The staff at work—office and field activities	58
Conclusion	58
Bibliography	59

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	Growth of professional and clerical staffs, 10 States, 1900–1923	4
2.	Comparison of professional and clerical staffs, all States, 1915 and 1920	5
3.	Comparison of number of public school children for each professional staff officer, 1915 and 1920	5
4.	Professional and clerical staffs, 32 States, 1915, 1920, 1923	6

Page

Table 5. Number of States performing certain functions under direct supervision of professional staff officers of department of education, 1900, 1910, 1915, 1920, 1923—based on replies of 30 States 7
6. Functions performed by professional staff officers as indicated by their official titles 8
7. Functions performed under direct supervision of professional staff officers in five State departments of education, 1923 9
8. Total cost of administering State departments of education, 8 States, 1900, 1910, 1920 10
9. Comparison of total salaries paid professional staffs, 36 States, 1915 and 1920 10
10. Comparison of total salaries of entire staff (professional and clerical) 23 States, 1915 and 1920 10
11. Expenditures of Department of State of New Jersey 11
12. Annual total expense, total expense per capita, and total expense per pupil of the offices of State superintendents of public instruction of various States, 1921 11
13. Divisions and numbers of professional employees by divisions, Massachusetts State Department of Education, 1923 13
14. Divisions and bureaus and number of professional employees in each, Connecticut State Department of Education, 1923 14
15. Divisions and number of professional employees by divisions, New York State Department of Education, 1923 14
16. Divisions and number of professional employees by divisions, New Jersey Department of Education, 1923 14
17. Divisions and bureaus and professional employees in each, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1923 14
18. Connecticut State and State-aided trade and vocational schools 22
19. Age at which 117 professional staff officers entered the service of State departments of education 33
20. Ages of 122 professional staff officers, April 1, 1923 33
21. Margin between entrance age and present age 34
22. Education of 127 professional staff officers in terms of graduation from highest institution attended, college and university graduation expressed in academic degrees 34
23. Percentage distribution of education 35
24. Positions held by 77 professional staff officers prior to entering State departments of education 35
25. Length of tenure of completed service in a given position for 56 professional staff officers 36
26. Length of tenure in present positions of 69 professional staff officers 37
27. Total length of service in State departments of education for 131 professional staff officers 38
28. Salaries of 256 professional staff officers in State departments of education, 1923 39
29. Comparison of salaries in certain professional positions, 1923 39
30. Salaries of 448 clerical employees in State departments of education, 1923 40
31. Summary of inspectional activities, school year 1921–22, division of examinations and inspections, New York 53

PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The chief factors in State administration of public education are the State board, the State superintendent, and the professional staff of State departments of education. Several valuable studies have been made of the State board and the State superintendent.[1] It is the purpose of the present study to supplement these with an investigation of the professional staff of State education departments. The term "professional staff" as employed throughout the ensuing discussion refers to those members of a State education department engaged in a type of service requiring professional knowledge, training, and experience for its proper execution. The term in its connotation excludes all who are engaged in clerical activities, such as typing, bookkeeping, filing, and the like. In Chapter III, in discussing the organization of State departments of education, the term "staff officer" is used in the technical sense of an advisory officer with no executive duties.

The study, with the exception of Chapter II, is confined to the professional staff of education departments in five States, viz, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Chapter II makes a survey of the development of State departments of education in the country at large, since 1900, in order to show the growth in the size and functional activity of the professional staff and to emphasize the need of a study of the professional staff. The remaining chapters deal intensively with the five States already named.

The following considerations influenced the writer in the selection of these States:

First. The manner of choosing the State board of education and the State superintendent in this group of States, shown below in

[1] The chief of these are: The New York Legislative Investigation, 1904; the Report of the Illinois Education Commission, 1909; Organization of State Departments of Education, Monahan, 1915; Organization of State Departments of Education, Neal and Kalbach, 1920; The Chief State Education Officer, Reeder, 1922. All of these, except the last, deal with both the State board and the State superintendent. See Bibliography for publishers.

tabular form, has given these Commonwealths a real opportunity to develop a philosophy of State administration of public education.

Who selects State board and State superintendent

	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania
State board of education	Governor	Governor	Legislature	Governor	Governor.
State superintendent	do	State board	State board	do	Do.

It will be seen that in each case the State board and the State superintendent are chosen by representatives of the people rather than by the people themselves. This degree of centralization in the method of selection makes for stabilized conditions and permits development and continuity in a State policy. In each of these States the department of education has had the opportunity to grow uninterrupted by the sudden changes in the personnel of the State board and the State superintendency which popular election frequently invites.

Second. Each of these States has a relatively large professional personnel in its department of education. In 1920 New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts had the largest professional staffs in the United States, numbering 151, 65, and 39, respectively. The professional staff in New Jersey numbered 19 and that of Connecticut 17 in the same year. Excluding New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, only six States in the Union had larger professional staffs than New Jersey and Connecticut.[2] Thus in this group of five States, three have professional staffs that exceed in numerical size all the other States, while two have staffs that are well above the average. The Commonwealths selected represent departments of education in a relatively high state of development.

Third. The functional activity of these five State departments covers virtually every field of endeavor in which the departments of the 48 States are engaged. The writer found 23 different functions performed by professional staff officers in 2 or more of the 48 States.[3] One of these functions, State publication, adoption or prescription of textbooks, is not performed by any one of the five States in the group studied. Of the remaining 22 functions, 7 are engaged in by all 5 States, 4 by 4 States, 10 by 3 States, and 1 by 2 States. Hence with one exception, it was possible to study the operation of each of these 22 functions in three or more States of the group.

Fourth. The proximity of each of the five States to Philadelphia, where the writer was temporarily located, enabled him to make per-

[2] See Table 4, p. 6.

[3] See Table 5, p. 7. See discussion of Table VII for method of determining these 23 functions.

sonal visits to these State education offices, and secure types of material that could be made available in no other way. The official point of view in each State office was learned by interviewing the commissioner and professional staff members; and authentic records and reports, many of which were confidential in nature, were made accessible. The facts presented about the five State education offices are on a comparable basis, as they were personally elicited by the investigator. There was "meeting of minds" between the interrogator and the interrogated.

Chapter II

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION SINCE 1900

The rapid growth and development of the personnel organization of State departments of public instruction have been outstanding features of American education in the last quarter of a century. This chapter will attempt to trace this growth in three respects: First, the numerical size of the staff; second, the increase in the number of functions performed by the professional staff; and third, the rise in costs of maintaining State departments of education.

The term "professional staff officer" as used throughout this study, and as defined in Chapter I, refers to an individual who is performing a type of service in a State department of education requiring professional knowledge, training, and experience.

The term "clerical staff" refers to those individuals who are doing clerical or stenographic work under the direction of professional officers.

Table 1 indicates that departments of education were relatively small down to 1910. In the period from 1910 to 1915 an appreciable development is noted, while the numerical increase after 1915 is striking and significant.

Since the greatest development has come after 1915, and especially between 1915 and 1920, this exceptional growth is studied, for all States, in Table 2. This table reveals that the enormous jump, noted for 10 States in Table 1, was quite general throughout the country, as regards both the professional and the clerical staffs.

TABLE 1.[1]—*Growth of professional and clerical staffs, in 10 States, 1900–1923*

State	1900		1910		1915		1920		1923	
	Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical
Arkansas	2	1	3	2	7	2	11	3	12	3
Connecticut	1	2	3	5	11	16	17	37	14	41
Massachusetts	5	3	9	6	11	12	39	75	38	110
Minnesota	4	3	6		10		22	23	24	30
New Jersey	3	3	4	5	8	17	12	31	16	29
Pennsylvania	3	5	5	6	10	9	65	45	63	80
Texas	2	6	2	5	2	7	31	22	33	25
Vermont	1	1	1	2	1	2	6	4	5	3
West Virginia	3	3	3	5	5	7	12	11	13	12
Wyoming	2	2	2	2	2	2	7	3	7	4
Total	26	29	38	38	67	74	222	254	225	337

[1] Based on returns of questionnaire to State education offices.

TABLE 2.[1]—*Comparison of professional and clerical staffs, in all States, 1915 and 1920*

State	Professional		Clerical		State	Professional		Clerical	
	1915	1920	1915	1920		1915	1920	1915	1920
Alabama	6	20	7	15	Nevada	6	5	1	1
Arizona	2	6	2	5	New Hampshire	7	9	4	9
Arkansas	7	11	2	3	New Jersey	7	19	14	17
California	5	17	9	29	New Mexico	3	5	2	5
Colorado	2	4	3	5	New York	----	151	----	----
Connecticut	11	17	16	37	North Carolina	5	20	4	9
Delaware	1	6	1	2	North Dakota	4	7	3	3
Florida	3	9	3	8	Ohio	15	18	7	8
Georgia	6	8	3	3	Oklahoma	3	8	6	6
Idaho	3	9	4	6	Oregon	5	5	3	6
Illinois	6	14	----	----	Pennsylvania	10	65	----	----
Indiana	6	9	6	10	Rhode Island	2	8	4	5
Iowa	6	12	1	11	South Carolina	4	14	----	----
Kansas	2	8	4	7	South Dakota	2	11	3	6
Kentucky	7	8	6	9	Tennessee	5	6	5	7
Louisiana	6	16	3	8	Texas	2	31	7	22
Maine	5	10	5	9	Utah	2	11	6	4
Maryland	3	9	1	7	Vermont	1	6	2	4
Massachusetts	11	39	12	75	Virginia	5	11	8	10
Michigan	3	16	14	16	Washington	5	12	5	6
Minnesota	10	22	----	----	West Virginia	6	5	7	7
Mississippi	3	12	2	7	Wisconsin	14	21	4	9
Missouri	5	13	5	7	Wyoming	2	7	----	----
Montana	2	7	3	2					
Nebraska	5	11	7	8	Total	221	768	204	434

[1] Based on Monahan for 1915, and Kalbach and Neal for 1920. See bibliography for titles.

TABLE 3.[1]—*Comparison of number of public school children for each professional staff officer, 1915 and 1920*

State	Number of children per each staff officer		State	Number of children per each staff officer	
	1915	1920		1915	1920
Alabama	77,601	28,497	Nebraska	37,865	28,347
Arizona	21,658	12,751	Nevada	2,102	2,823
Arkansas	63,889	43,925	New Hampshire	10,838	7,134
California	101,718	40,955	New Jersey	74,269	31,304
Colorado	95,805	55,058	New Mexico	26,268	16,280
Connecticut	19,860	15,380	New York	----	11,390
Delaware	32,511	6,414	North Carolina	121,270	34,562
Florida	56,051	25,018	North Dakota	37,912	24,040
Georgia	104,309	86,466	Ohio	62,052	56,703
Idaho	30,122	12,799	Oklahoma	165,241	73,660
Illinois	177,370	80,540	Oregon	28,360	30,206
Indiana	92,154	62,921	Pennsylvania	146,194	24,776
Iowa	87,070	42,677	Rhode Island	43,532	11,688
Kansas	196,192	50,860	South Carolina	93,210	34,146
Kentucky	72,609	66,918	South Dakota	65,421	13,360
Louisiana	50,745	22,130	Tennessee	117,237	103,309
Maine	29,537	13,768	Texas	475,000	33,408
Maryland	85,756	26,846	Utah	52,528	10,673
Massachusetts	53,780	15,989	Vermont	65,730	10,297
Michigan	199,386	43,230	Virginia	94,842	45,926
Minnesota	46,606	22,891	Washington	48,104	24,254
Mississippi	164,252	34,389	West Virginia	48,429	69,251
Missouri	142,271	51,729	Wisconsin	33,231	22,154
Montana	47,297	18,082	Wyoming	21,556	6,159

[1] Based on Table 2, plus enrollment figures issued by U. S. Bureau of Education for the years indicated.

55058—25†——2

TABLE 4.[1]—*Professional and clerical staffs, in 32 States, 1915, 1920, 1923*

State	1915		1920		1923		State	1915		1920		1923	
	Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical		Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical	Professional	Clerical
Arkansas	7	2	11	3	12	3	New Mexico	3	2	5	5	5	4
California	6	12	13	29	14	30	North Carolina	5	4	20	9	35	18
Colorado	2	3	4	5	4	5	North Dakota	4	3	7	3	8	3
Connecticut	11	16	17	37	14	41	Oklahoma	3	6	8	6	10	6
Delaware	1	1	6	2	5	5	Oregon	5	3	5	6	5	5
Georgia	6	3	8	3	8	3	Pennsylvania	10	9	63	45	63	80
Idaho	3	4	9	6	7	7	Rhode Island	2	4	8	5	8	5
Indiana	6	6	9	10	11	15	South Carolina	4	----	14	7	14	10
Kansas	2	4	8	7	8	10	Texas	2	7	31	22	33	25
Maine	5	5	10	9	11	12	Utah	2	6	11	4	8	5
Maryland	3	1	9	7	10	7	Vermont	1	2	6	4	5	3
Massachusetts	11	12	39	75	38	110	Virginia	5	8	11	10	15	15
Michigan	3	14	16	16	16	26	Washington	5	5	12	6	14	9
Minnesota	10	----	22	23	24	30	West Virginia	5	7	12	11	13	12
Montana	2	3	7	2	6	2	Wyoming	2	2	7	3	7	4
Nevada	6	1	5	1	5	3							
New Jersey	8	17	12	31	16	29	Total	150	172	427	412	452	542

[1] Based on questionnaires returned by State education offices.

Table 3 is designed to show by another method the phenomenal increase in the professional staff between 1915 and 1920, and to suggest the greater effectiveness of State departments of education because of this increase. The material reduction in the number of school children for each professional staff officer means closer supervision on the part of the State, and therefore higher standards for local schools, especially rural and village schools.

The situation from 1915 to 1923 is presented in Table 4. Since data are given for 32 States, the tendencies reflected are, no doubt, typical of conditions throughout the country. Table 4 reveals that the professional staff has been relatively stationary since 1920, while the clerical staff has continued to grow apace. While there was a net gain of 25 professional staff officers between 1920 and 1923, yet 18 States of the 32 made no gain and eight States actually show a loss. On the other hand, the net gain in total of clerical staff for the 32 States was 130, and 20 States show increase in clerical personnel.

Two general explanations may be offered for the phenomenal growth in the personnel of State departments of education between 1915 and 1920. The first is the stimulus due to the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. Later, when we consider growth by function, we shall see that only nine States reported a staff officer in charge of vocational education in 1915, as opposed to 44 States reporting such an officer in 1920. In 1915, in a total of 221 professional staff officers in 47 States, only 20, or 9 per cent of the whole, were engaged in the fields covered by the Smith-Hughes Act.[1]

[1] New York excluded.

In 1920, in a total of 617 professional officers, 168, or 27 per cent of the whole, were engaged in the field of vocational education.[2] While the whole number of professional staff officers in the United States increased 179 per cent in the five-year period, the number engaged in vocational fields increased 740 per cent. This rate of increase is more impressive when contrasted with 123 per cent, the rate at which the number of professional officers, engaged in all other fields, increased between 1915 and 1920.

A second general reason probably for this rapid increase in the personnel of State departments of education between 1915 and 1920 was the World War. The war made of public education a patriotic shibboleth, and State departments naturally expanded at a period when purse strings were elastic. Local reasons, such as a strong constructive chief officer of the type of Kendal or Finegan, undoubtedly explain the growth in the case of a few individual States.

The reasons for the situation since 1920 are more problematic. It may be that the clerical staff has had a more normal growth and is continuing to grow in order to catch up with the professional staff, following the tremendous increase in the period from 1915 to 1920. It may also be a reflection of the policy of retrenchment following the era of large appropriations that accompanied the war. Clerical salaries are much lower than professional salaries; so some States may be following a policy of replacing professional people with clerical people, or at least expanding with clerical people.

TABLE 5.—*Number of States performing certain functions under direct supervision of professional staff officers of departments of education in 1900, 1910, 1915, 1920, and 1923; based on replies of 30 States*

Function	1900	1910	1915	1920	1923
1. Vocational education	0	3	8	29	28
2. High schools	3	5	16	25	27
3. Rural schools	1	4	11	20	24
4. Certification of teachers	4	7	7	20	26
5. Teacher training	1	1	3	15	16
6. Special subjects (music, art, health, etc.)	1	2	5	9	10
7. Elementary graded schools	3	4	6	8	10
8. Americanization	0	0	0	11	13
9. Teacher placement service	0	1	4	10	17
10. School buildings	1	1	2	7	12
11. Special education (mentally and physically deficient)	0	0	0	3	6
12. Retirement fund	0	0	3	9	10
13. Attendance	1	2	2	5	8
14. Higher education (including normal schools)	2	2	3	7	9
15. School libraries	1	1	3	4	9
16. Evening schools	0	0	1	4	9
17. Legal service	2	2	2	2	4
18. Editorial	0	2	3	5	5
19. Textbooks	1	2	3	5	7
20. Professional licensing (doctors, dentists, etc.)	1	1	1	2	2
21. Academic subjects	1	1	1	2	5
22. Educational measurements	0	0	0	2	4
23. Continuation schools	0	0	0	3	5

[2] Data from bulletins of U. S. Bu. of Educ., 1915, No. 5, pp. 40–46; 1920, No. 46, pp. 39–48.

TABLE 6.—*Functions performed by professional staff officers in New York, as indicated by their official titles*

[The mark (×) indicates in what States the function is performed]

Function	1900	1910	1915	1920	1923
1. Vocational education		×	×	×	×
2. High schools	×	×	×	×	×
3. Rural schools				×	×
4. Certification of teachers				×	×
5. Teacher training				×	×
6. Special subjects (music, art, health, etc.)		×	×	×	×
7. Elementary graded schools	×	×	×	×	×
8. Americanization				×	×
9. Teacher placement service					
10. School buildings	×	×	×	×	×
11. Special education (mentally and physically deficient)				×	×
12. Retirement fund			×	×	×
13. Attendance	×	×	×	×	×
14. Higher education (including normal schools)	×	×	×	×	×
15. School libraries	×	×	×	×	×
16. Evening schools			×	×	×
17. Legal service	×	×	×	×	×
18. Editorial		×	×	×	×
19. Textbooks					
20. Professional licensing (doctors, dentists, etc.)	×	×	×	×	×
21. Academic subjects	×	×	×	×	×
22. Educational measurements				×	×
23. Continuation schools					×

The State reaching the highest functional development is New York, which was performing 22 of the 23 functions in 1923. The development in this State is shown in Table 6.

In order to get a more complete picture of this functional development of State departments of education, the writer drafted a questionnaire which was sent to each of the 48 State education offices. Replies were received from 30 States, and the tabulated results are shown in Table 5.[5] This table shows that the phenomenal growth in the numerical size of State departments of education was paralleled by a like expansion in the functional activities of staff officers. Unlike the numerical growth, the functional development has continued during the period 1920–1923. The increase in the number of States having staff officers engaged in specific supervision is noteworthy in the following functions: Rural schools, certification of teachers, elementary graded schools, teacher placement, school buildings, school libraries, and evening schools.

[5] States replying: Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming.

TABLE 7.—*Functions performed under direct supervision of professional staff officers in five State departments of education, 1923*

[The mark (×) indicates in what States the function is performed]

Function	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania
1. Vocational education	×	×	×	×	×
2. High schools	×	×	×	×	×
3. Rural schools		×	×		×
4. Certification of teachers	×	×	×	×	×
5. Teacher training	×	×	×	×	×
6. Special subjects (music, art, health, etc.)	×	×	×	×	×
7. Elementary graded schools	×	×	×	×	
8. Americanization	×	×	×		×
9. Teacher placement service	×	×			×
10. School buildings		×	×	×	×
11. Special education (mentally and physically deficient)	×	×	×	×	×
12. Retirement fund	×	×	×	×	×
13. Attendance		×	×		×
14. Higher education (including normal schools)	×	×	×		×
15. School libraries		×	×		×
16. Evening schools	×	×	×		
17. Legal service			×	×	×
18. Editorial		×	×	×	
19. Textbooks					
20. Professional licensing (doctors, dentists, etc.)			×	×	×
21. Academic subjects		×	×		×
22. Educational measurements		×	×		
23. Continuation schools	×		×		×

The intensive study of the professional staff and its work found in subsequent chapters will be confined to five States: Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Table 7 shows the functional activity in each of these States. No one of these States prescribes official textbooks, and therefore they have no officers for this function. For every other function, except educational measurements, at least three of the States have specific staff officers. Thus it can be seen that the opportunity for a thorough study of the functions performed by State departments of education exists in this group of Commonwealths.

To briefly summarize the section on functional growth, we find that in 1920 the activities directed by professional staff officers had grown in number to 23. In 1900 only 14 of these functions were so directed, and not more than four States performed any one function. We further find that four of these functions, to wit, vocational education, high schools, rural schools, and certification of teachers, are quite commonly cared for, but there is great diversity as to the other 19 functions. Functional development has paralleled the numerical growth of the professional staff, except that it has continued apace since 1920, whereas the numerical growth in the same time has been insignificant.

COSTS

The third evidence of growth in State departments of education is increased cost of maintenance. Cost data, except for recent years, are difficult to procure. This explains why Table 8, showing cost increase since 1900, is for eight States only. It will be noted, from

this table, that cost increase paralleled growth in size of staff and functional activity. The significant rise comes after 1910.

TABLE 8.—*Total cost of administering State departments of education, eight States, 1900, 1910, and 1920* [1]

State	1900	1910	1920
Arkansas	$4,900	$8,000	$25,000
Delaware		[2] 5,000	61,911
Indiana	8,000	10,000	40,000
Maryland		3,729	59,693
Massachusetts	17,255	50,896	306,636
Texas	16,255	21,370	135,197
Washington [3]	6,200	17,770	54,075
West Virginia [4]	3,600	11,700	27,000

[1] Based on returns from State education offices.
[2] Estimated.
[3] One-half biennial appropriation.
[4] Appropriation for salaries only.

TABLE 9.[1]—*Comparison of total salaries paid professional staffs, in 36 States, in 1915 and 1920*

State	1915	1920	Increase	Per cent increase	State	1915	1920	Increase	Per cent increase
Alabama	$11,600	$63,450	$51,850	447	Missouri	$10,600	$36,400	$25,800	243
Arizona	5,000	17,900	12,900	258	Montana	7,200	15,500	8,300	115
California	21,800	50,300	28,500	131	Nebraska	9,400	25,000	15,600	166
Colorado	4,800	11,400	6,600	138	Nevada	13,600	14,250	650	5
Delaware	2,000	23,700	21,700	1,050	New Jersey	35,000	78,133	43,133	123
Florida	5,600	32,400	26,800	479	New Mexico	6,000	18,050	12,050	200
Georgia	14,600	36,500	22,500	154	North Carolina	12,500	56,500	44,000	352
Idaho	12,250	28,010	15,760	128	North Dakota	9,400	16,300	6,900	73
Indiana	20,300	29,300	9,000	44	Ohio	29,100	40,480	11,380	39
Iowa	14,500	30,740	16,240	112	Oklahoma	8,300	17,400	9,100	110
Kansas	4,100	20,100	16,000	390	Oregon	11,100	11,340	240	2
Louisiana	18,500	53,600	35,100	190	Pennsylvania	23,000	254,350	231,350	1,006
Maine	11,700	28,450	16,750	143	Tennessee	12,600	25,000	12,400	98
Maryland	5,000	47,500	42,500	850	Vermont	2,500	16,340	13,840	553
Massachusetts	36,200	103,810	67,610	187	Virginia	12,000	43,750	31,750	265
Michigan	8,300	39,000	30,700	370	Washington	9,800	31,790	21,990	224
Minnesota	25,400	65,250	39,850	157	West Virginia	13,800	21,140	7,340	53
Mississippi	7,000	40,600	33,600	480	Wyoming	3,000	18,080	15,080	500

[1] Based on Monahan for 1915 figures, and on Kalbach and Neal for 1920 figures.

TABLE 10.[1]—*Comparison of total salaries of entire staff (professional and clerical) in 23 States, in 1915 and 1920*

State	1915	1920	Increase	Per cent increase	State	1915	1920	Increase	Per cent increase
Alabama	$19,880	$83,010	$63,130	318	Nevada	$14,500	$15,750	$1,250	9
Arizona	7,100	24,800	17,700	250	New Jersey	48,650	100,103	51,453	106
Colorado	8,400	16,000	7,600	90	New Mexico	8,400	22,850	14,450	172
Florida	9,500	38,800	29,300	308	North Carolina	17,300	69,140	51,840	300
Georgia	17,300	40,300	23,000	133	Ohio	39,190	52,036	12,846	33
Iowa	16,000	44,420	28,420	178	Oklahoma	14,900	26,600	11,700	79
Kansas	8,100	27,340	19,230	238	Vermont	4,100	21,260	17,160	418
Louisiana	23,000	67,700	44,700	195	Virginia	22,750	56,790	34,040	150
Maryland	6,000	55,900	49,900	832					
Mississippi	8,800	52,900	44,100	501	Washington	23,700	44,210	20,510	87
Montana	8,600	19,400	9,800	102	West Virginia	21,620	31,260	9,640	44
Nebraska	17,200	33,500	16,300	95	Wyoming	4,500	22,400	17,900	398

[1] Same sources as Table 9.

TABLE 11.—*Expenditures of department of public instruction, State of New Jersey, by years*[1]

Division	1914–15			1919–20			1922–23		
	Staff	Clerical	Total	Staff	Clerical	Total	Staff	Clerical	Total
Commissioner	$10,000	$2,400	$12,400	$10,000	$1,750	$11,750	$10,000	$3,060	$13,060
Educational division	18,387	7,332	25,720	29,780	16,026	45,806	43,700	20,387	64,087
Law division	4,025	960	4,985	5,000	1,414	6,414	6,500	1,800	8,300
Business division	7,000	5,831	12,831	11,180	9,626	20,806	16,960	13,391	30,351
Blanks and forms			14,480			13,540			23,000
Other expenses			11,430			20,960			23,850
Total	39,412	16,523	81,846	55,960	28,816	119,276	77,160	38,638	162,648

[1] Prepared by business division, New Jersey State Department.

Rise in costs for the period 1915–1920 is shown in Tables 9 and 10. These tables present total amounts spent for salaries. Since for the year 1921–22 salaries constituted 83 per cent of the total costs of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, the significance of Tables 9 and 10 may be appreciated. It will be seen from Table 9 that all but seven of the 36 States at least doubled the amount spent for professional salaries between 1915 and 1920. Table 10 reveals that all but seven of 23 States at least doubled this total salary roll in the same period. The per cent of increase for total department salaries is not as great as for professional salaries. This is due to the fact that clerical salaries advanced more moderately.

An analysis of cost increase in the New Jersey Department of Education over an eight-year period is presented in Table 11. The largest increase proportionately is for the educational division, which renders the professional service of the department.

TABLE 12.[1]—*Annual total expense, total expense per capita, and total expense per pupil of the offices of State superintendents of public instruction of various States, 1921*

State	Total expense	Expense per capita	Expense per pupil
Ohio	$100,690	$0.0175	$0.099
Illinois	221,270	.0341	.184
Indiana	116,515	.0397	.202
Michigan	152,535	.0416	.216
Pennsylvania	476,656	.0546	.275
New Jersey	182,590	.0579	.309
Massachusetts	311,504	.0809	.503
Minnesota	208,110	.0874	.412
Wisconsin	233,025	.0886	.460
Connecticut	519,050	.137	.730

[1] This table is a combination of Tables 67 and 67–A Fiscal Policies, Updegraff and King.

Table 12 shows the cost per capita and the cost per pupil of departments of education in 10 States, all of which have well-organized staffs. It will be seen that the annual cost per capita ranges from less than 2 cents in Ohio to less than 14 cents in Connecticut. The

annual cost per pupil varies from less than 10 cents in Ohio to 73 cents in Connecticut. While these per capita and per pupil amounts are not great, the range of 12 cents in the cost per capita between the highest and lowest States, and of 63 cents per pupil between the highest and lowest States, is very significant. Costs of maintaining State departments of education seem less standardized than functional practice.

This chapter served to demonstrate that State departments of education since 1900 have grown tremendously, first, in the number of their personnel, especially on the professional side; second, in the number of functions performed and in the increasing tendency of the States individually to assume more of these functions; and third, in the cost of supporting these enlarged activities.

It seems quite fitting and proper, in view of this phenomenal growth of State education offices, to ask who are the people that are manning the professional staffs of these organizations and what are they doing. This the subsequent chapters propose to do so far as the professional staffs in the five States already enumerated are concerned.

Chapter III

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS, CONNECTICUT, NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, AND PENNSYLVANIA

A brief survey of the organization and functional activities of the departments of education in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania will give a general idea of the work of the professional staff, and at the same time will furnish a background for the subsequent discussion of the professional staff of these States. This survey will cover, first, a list of the divisions and independent bureaus, with the number of professional employees in each; second, a critical survey of the organization of each State department; third, a descriptive account of the work of the various divisions and bureaus in the five States.

Tables 13 to 17, inclusive, list the divisions and bureaus, with professional employees in each, for Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The information for New York was supplied by the administration bureau of the State department. For the other States, the data were taken from education directories of these States for 1923.

TABLE 13.—*Divisions and numbers of professional employees by divisions, Massachusetts State Department of Education, 1923*

Divisions	Professional employees
Elementary, secondary, and normal schools	[1] 6
Vocational education	17
University extension	7
Immigration and Americanization	[2] 2
Public libraries	3
Blind	1
Teachers' retirement board	1
Total	37

[1] Ten normal school principals excluded.
[2] Interpreters and field secretaries excluded.

TABLE 14.—*Divisions and bureaus and number of professional employees in each, Connecticut State Department of Education, 1923*

Divisions and bureaus	Professional employees	Divisions and bureaus	Professional employees
Accounts and purchases	1	Tests and investigations	1
Americanization	1	Vocational education	3
Attendance and employment	[1] 1	Editorial	1
Elementary education	1	Special investigations	1
Physical education and health	1	Statistics	2
Rural education	[2] 4	Certification of teachers	1
Normal schools	[3] 1		
Secondary education	1	Total	21
Special education and standards	1		

[1] Eight agents resident in field excluded.
[2] Rural supervisors resident in field excluded; three regional supervisors included.
[3] Four normal school principals excluded.

TABLE 15.—*Divisions and number of professional employees by divisions, New York State Department of Education, 1923*

Divisions	Professional employees	Divisions	Professional employees
Higher education	18	Finance	3
Secondary education	2	Law	2
Elementary education	19	Library extensions	10
State library	44	School buildings and grounds	3
State museum	14	Visual instruction	4
Administration	7	Vocational and extension education	31
Archives and history	4		
Attendance	5		
Examinations and inspections	34	Total	200

TABLE 16.—*Divisions and number of professional employees by divisions, New Jersey Department of Education, 1923*

Divisions	Professional employees	Divisions	Professional employees
Academic credentials and summer schools	1	Secondary education	1
Business	6	Teachers' certificates and examinations	1
Elementary education	1	Vocational education	7
Law	2		
Physical training and hygiene	3	Total	22

TABLE 17.—*Divisions and bureaus and professional employees in each, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1923*

Divisions and bureaus	Professional employees	Divisions and bureaus	Professional employees
Higher education	1	Rural education	4
Law	1	School buildings	4
Secondary education	1	School employees' retirement	1
Administration	3	Special education	3
Americanization	6	Teacher	4
Attendance	5	Vocational	[1] 14
Health	7	Subject directors	14
Preprofessional and professional credentials	2	Total	70

[1] Fifteen county supervisors excluded.

ORGANIZATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION [1]

The several divisions and the professional employees, in each, for the Massachusetts Department of Education are shown in Table 13.

The chief administrative officer for the internal functioning of the department is the chief clerk, a nonprofessional officer. This is in sharp contrast to the practice in New York and Pennsylvania, where the chief administrative officer for the department is the head of the administrative division, a professional officer who must combine executive ability of high order with a thorough knowledge of the educational problems of the State.

In the second place, the tendency to assign new functions to the department of education when State government is reorganized and consolidated is strikingly illustrated by Massachusetts. The various departments, commissions, and boards were reduced to 20 departments in a reorganization of the Massachusetts State government in 1920.

When the commissioner of education stated to the writer that "certain inconsistencies" existed as a result of the reorganization, he evidently had this situation in mind. There is always the danger in consolidating governmental agencies that some functions will be assigned departments whose experience and traditions are not in keeping with the new responsibilities. Thus, in Massachusetts the division of immigration and Americanization is engaged in a pure type of social service, while adult education, in so far as it is related to schools, has no place in its program. The division of the blind is concerned as much with the employment and relief of the blind as it is with their education.

---

[1] Two types of organization defined and described by writers on industrial management predominate in the organizations of the five State departments of education. These types are the "functional" and the "line and staff."

"Functional organization consists in so dividing the work of management that each man from the assistant superintendent down shall have as few functions as possible to perform." (*F. W. Taylor, quoted by Duncan, Principles of Industrial Management, p. 188.*)

The following principle of line and staff organization was formulated by Prof. Harlan Updegraff:

"This principle requires in so far as the environing conditions permit:

"(1) That a competent forceful manager possessing initiative, sanity, and vision be the chief planner and chief executive of the enterprise (the school system), and that all legislative and executive acts focus in him.

"(2) That the various units of the enterprise and the manager be connected with each other into a unified, compact, and yet as simple as possible an organization through two series of closely related organs:

"(*a*) 'The staff,' which will give in the quickest and surest manner complete and accurate knowledge and as expert advice as possible concerning the condition in every unit and in the enterprise as a whole; and

"(*b*) 'The line,' which will secure in the most direct and certain manner the execution of decisions based upon the knowledge and advice thus gained.

"(3) That these two series of organs be so coordinated that whenever it contributes to efficiency, subordinate line officers may act upon knowledge and advice of a coordinate subordinate staff officer without waiting for directions from above, and without knowledge and advice passing to higher staff or line officer.

"(4) That any two coordinate staff and line organs may, when efficiency makes it desirable or environing conditions require it, be exercised by the same person.

"(5) That the distribution of authority and responsibility for the various functions of line and staff and the courses which various types of administrative action should take be clearly defined and in such a way that accountability of subordinate to superior officers will be exacted." (*Efficiency Principles Adapted to Administration and Management of Schools, unpublished.*)

The organization of the Massachusetts Department of Education is well knit and compact. This is especially true of the older divisions that constituted the department before 1920. The commissioner is the real head of the department, since the State board of education is merely advisory. This situation makes for unity in policy and execution. There are no assistant commissioners in Massachusetts, and each division director is responsible immediately to the commissioner. Although the directors spend some time in the field, especially those in the older divisions, their principal duty is to supervise and coordinate the work of their field agents. The division heads, with one exception, are limited to general direction. The director of the division of elementary, secondary, and normal schools is personally responsible for the normal schools.

Massachusetts has two distinct types of organization in its department of education; the older divisions represent the "line and staff" type, and the newer divisions the "committee" type. As used in this chapter, a "line officer" is one who executes, and a "staff officer" is one who advises. The term "staff" in its technical sense relative to principles of organization must not be confused with "staff" in the more general sense of the members of an organization. Except for this discussion of organization, the term is used in the general sense throughout the study. In the divisions of elementary and secondary education and normal schools, vocational education, and university extension the directors are line officers, while the supervisors and agents under them are staff officers. In the divisions added since 1900 the real executive is a board or a commission.

ORGANIZATION OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The organization of the Connecticut Department of Education is largely of the functional variety in which one expert executes the work of each division or bureau. Although smaller in area and population than either Massachusetts or New Jersey, Connecticut's State department has six more divisions and bureaus than the former and seven more than the latter. While the Connecticut organization is predominately functional in type, it also partakes of the "line and staff" in that the commissioner is the line officer for the department. There are no assistant commissioners in Connecticut, and all division and bureau heads work directly under the commissioner. Connecticut's organization furnishes one unique feature for the group of five States in that the commissioner is a functional officer as well as a line officer. He is personally responsible for the normal schools of the State.

The mainspring of the internal organism is the chief clerk as in the case of Massachusetts.

ORGANIZATION OF THE NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The New York State Department presents an excellent study in line and staff organization. The board of regents, whose mandates are law, stand at the head of the organization. The commissioner is chief line officer to the department. He carries out the legislation of the regents. The four assistant commissioners, including the deputy, are virtually pure staff officers. True the assistant commissioner for elementary education has under his direction five bureaus, but the other three assistant commissioners are primarily advisers and not directors. The line officers are the directors of the several divisions. These are the men who put over the work of the department in the State. They furnish the punch and the drive and execute through their subordinates the program of the regents and the commissioner.

The clearing point for the internal organization of the New York department is the administration division. Departmental activity centers in the chief of this division, and most matters reaching the attention of the commissioner first pass through his hands.

ORGANIZATION OF THE NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The organization of the New Jersey Department of Education is a combination of the "line and staff" and "functional" types. The commissioner is the line officer of the department, while the assistant commissioners and division chiefs are his advisers, and in that sense are staff officers. At the same time, the deputy commissioner and the assistant commissioners for elementary and secondary education are pure examples of functional officers. Each is an expert acting in an executive capacity in regard to certain functions. These functional officers of New Jersey are field men, in contrast to line officers who, for the most part, are desk men.

One feature of the New Jersey organization deserves especial notice. The divisions care for field activities, while the bureaus look after office activities. The bureau of physical training and hygiene is the one exception to this generalization, and its logical place would seem to be under the direction of one of the assistant commissioners.

The internal organization of the New Jersey State education office is directed by the secretary to the commissioner.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State Department of Education is a highly developed line and staff organization. The superintendent of public instruction is the line officer for all the activities of the department.

The deputy superintendents, the director of the professional credentials bureau, and the subject directors are staff officers, whose work in the office and in the field is advisory. The director of the administration bureau is the line officer for the internal organization. He stands between the superintendent and the several bureau heads. He also stands between the department and the officers of the local school districts in many important particulars. The line officers, who carry out the program of the department in the State, are the directors of the attendance, health, retirement, rural education, school buildings, special education, teacher, vocational bureaus. The work of each of these bureaus has a definite legal basis, a circumstance which enhances the power of these line officers in the State.

In addition to affording the highest development of line and staff organization, the position of the administration bureau is a distinct contribution that the Pennsylvania department makes in the field of State department organization. The State council of education and the superintendent of public instruction work through the administration bureau. It is the focal point not only of departmental routine within the office at Harrisburg but of all the functional activities of the department as well.

WORK OF THE SEVERAL DIVISIONS IN THE MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION [1]

Reference to Table 13, page 13, will disclose that there are seven divisions within the Massachusetts Department of Education. The work of these divisions will be described in the order in which they stand in the table.

Elementary, secondary, and normal schools.—The director of the division of elementary, secondary, and normal schools is the ranking division head of the department. He is responsible for editing the annual report of the department and the publications of the division. He is also charged with the supervision of the 10 State normal schools.

There are five bureaus or sections in this division, namely, physical education, elementary education, secondary education, research and statistics, teachers' registration. The work of the physical education bureau is largely promotional, although a certain amount of supervision and inspection is done in the schools of the State. Through addresses at educational meetings and through printed bulletins the program of the bureau is made known. The bureau has charge of summer normal schools for physical training.

The principal duties of the supervisor of elementary education are the following: Editing and revising State courses of study for elementary schools, inspecting elementary schools and recommending

[1] This description was written from notes of interviews made in the Massachusetts State education office. Where other materials are used, the citation will be given.

improvements, planning teachers' institutes, making addresses, overseeing transportation of pupils, reorganizing union superintendencies, holding office conferences, and attending to correspondence.

The bureau of secondary education has general supervision of the 250 high schools of Massachusetts. One hundred of these schools are State aided and must conform to certain legal standards, which are enforced by this bureau. The certification of teachers in State-aided high schools is charged to the bureau. The supervisor of secondary education organizes and conducts State conferences with high-school principals, advises with school authorities in regard to new buildings, and makes occasional surveys of high schools.

The principal duties of the bureau of research and statistics are the following: Collection, examination, tabulation, and publication of statistics relative to public schools; editing the annual report of the department; preparation of circulars of information; placement of deaf and blind children in special schools; preparation and distribution to towns of census cards, school registers, and medical inspection material.

The agent in charge of registration of teachers conducts a placement service for the teachers and school authorities of Massachusetts. Although teachers of other States are registered, placement is made only within the State. Approximately 9,000 teachers are registered with this bureau.

Division of vocational education.—Instead of making one agent responsible for each of the four fields (agriculture, household arts, industrial education, and continuation schools), there are three subdivisions (supervision, administration, and teacher training), headed by agents responsible for all four fields. The activities of the vocational division are so vast that even a descriptive summary will not be attempted. Suffice it to say that in 1921 there were 172 vocational schools of one kind and another, located in 78 cities and towns.[2]

Division of university extension.—The division of university extension has put into effect a comprehensive program of adult education both for English-speaking and non-English-speaking persons. Courses are conducted by correspondence and by extension instructors at various centers of the State. The division was established in 1915, and in the first seven years of its existence had enrolled a total of 100,000 students. In the act of 1915 establishing it the division was—

> authorized to cooperate with existing institutions of learning in the establishment and conduct of university extension and correspondence courses; * * * and also, where it is deemed advisable, to establish and conduct university extension and correspondence courses for the benefit of residents of Massachusetts.

The field of adult education for non-English-speaking people was added in 1919.[3]

---

[2] Eighty-fifth An. Rep. Mass. Dept. of Ed., p. 195.

[3] See article by James A. Moyer, Jour. of N. E. A., Vol. XI, No. 10, Dec., 1922, pp. 405–407.

Division of immigration and Americanization.—The primary function is to prevent exploitation of the newcomer. Two types of service rendered by the division are to assist the immigrant in the naturalization process, and to aid him in bringing relatives to America.

The *division of public libraries* has general supervision of the free public libraries of the State, which numbered 424 in 1921. The division maintains a field service, especially for the aid of libraries in the smaller towns. The service of the division is also extended to the public schools, and library courses are encouraged in the normal schools.[4]

The *division of the blind* is engaged in three types of service: The education of the blind, the relief of the blind, and the employment of the blind. An important feature of the educational work is the sight-saving classes. There were 19 such classes in Massachusetts early in 1922.

These classes are equipped with special desks; large, clear-typed textbooks, and other material suitable for the instruction of the visually handicapped child. The class unit is small enough to permit individual instruction, and pupils can be kept up to grade.[5]

Teachers' retirement board.—The principal functions performed are to check deductions of school committees; to keep an account for each individual member; to determine amount of annuities; and to compute the pensions of the voluntary class.

WORK OF THE SEVERAL DIVISIONS AND BUREAUS OF THE CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION[6]

The 15 divisions and bureaus of the Connecticut Department of Education are listed in Table 14. Of these the first 11 are classed as divisions and those remaining as bureaus.

The director of *accounts and purchases* is the purchasing agent for the department of education, the normal schools, and the trade schools. He prepares standardized forms for local school districts. The bookkeeping for the department is done in this division.

The *division of Americanization* is engaged in the task of making "loyal, active, and intelligent" citizens. The program is carried out not only through Americanization classes but also through community campaigns in which organizations such as the chamber of commerce, the rotary club, and the Young Men's Christian Association are enlisted. The division's motion picture, "The Making of An American," illustrates another method of attack upon the problem.[7]

The *attendance and employment division* is charged with the enforcement of the compulsory attendance and child-labor laws. Its

[4] Eighty-fifth An. Rep., Mass. Dept. of Educ., pp. 111–114.
[5] Ibid, p. 110.
[6] This section is based on notes of interviews unless otherwise stated.
[7] See Rep. Conn. Bd. of Educ., 1920, pp. 19–22, for further account of work of this division.

agents go into those towns not having regular attendance officers. Two agents of the division have the power to prosecute.

The director of the *division of elementary education* confines his activities to the larger towns, since the rural districts are well cared for in Connecticut by the division of rural education. The division of elementary education has prepared an excellent syllabus, entitled "Plans for Progress," for use in the elementary schools.

The director of *physical education and health* was in the midst of a promotional campaign when the writer visited Hartford in the spring of 1923. Although the position had been but recently created, the director had produced four manuals and numerous circulars to further the health work of the schools. The division was working for two definite goals: (1) A full-time physical instructor for the larger schools; (2) a health nurse for every town.

Connecticut makes a distinct contribution to State educational administration in its handling of the rural school problem. The director of *rural education* has 36 agents, resident in the field, constantly engaged in supervision. Ninety-seven towns were served by these agents in 1923. The following statement concerning the supervising agents and their duties will give a clear picture of the work of the rural education division.

DUTIES OF SUPERVISING AGENTS [8]

Since 1903 State aid has been provided for the supervision of the schools of the smaller towns of Connecticut. First, part of the salary of the supervising agent was paid by the town. To-day any town with 25 teachers or less may make application for the appointment of a supervising agent, whose salary and expenses are paid by the State board of education.

According to the statute these supervising agents are the acting school visitors of the towns in which they supervise. Usually a supervisor has from 35 to 40 teachers and from three to four towns under his supervision.

In order that there may be a general understanding of the responsibilities which rest upon supervisors as agents of the town school committees and as representatives and agents of the State board of education, there has been prepared the following statement of practice:

1. The supervising agents as "acting school visitors" will be held responsible to the town school committees they serve as well as to this board, through the commissioner of education, for the organization, progress, and tone of the school systems in their charge and for the classification, management, and progress of the pupils therein.

2. They shall in general visit each school twice a month for the purpose of improving the instruction and promoting the progress of the pupils and of noting the condition of the school property.

3. They shall report each month upon blanks prescribed by the commissioner of education and make special reports as requested by the director of rural education with the approval of the commissioner.

4. They shall, in towns eligible to the support of school grants, formally notify, in writing, the commissioner, through the director of rural education of (1) any teacher who is not managing or teaching successfully and any teacher

[8] Connecticut Schools, vol. 5. No. 2; October, 1923, p. 3.

who should for any reason be disapproved, and (2) any building which is not in good repair.

5. They are instructed to keep the local school officers informed of the needs of the schools, of the supervisor's work, and of the work of each teacher, the attendance of the children, the condition of the buildings, and from time to time of such other facts as will fix local responsibility and will enable school officers to act intelligently.

6. They shall, either at teachers' meetings or at such other times as seem most convenient, exclusive of regular visits and preferably outside of school hours give to each elementary teacher at least two hours of instruction each month and give or cause to be given like instruction to each high-school teacher.

7. Each supervisor shall exercise educational leadership in his towns and shall keep his communities informed of the needs and progress of the schools, and of educational movements in the State and Nation, and shall use all practicable means to this end, including public meetings.

8. As agents of the State board of education they shall be responsible for the attendance of all pupils in their schools. They shall report to the director of rural education all cases which in their judgment require prosecution and submit therewith such evidence and records as may be required under the rules approved by the commissioner.

The director of the *division of secondary education* has general supervision of the 92 high schools of the State. He visits each school at least once a year, and files a detailed report of each visit. The director advises with local authorities as to the daily programs, courses of study, and school buildings.

TABLE 18.[1]—*Connecticut State and State-aided trade and vocational schools*

State trade schools	All-day schools	Part-time schools	Evening schools	High schools	Coop. soldier section	Machinist	Auto. screw mach.	Toolmaking	Carpentry	Masonry	Pattern making	Electrical	Plumbing	Painting	Printing	Drafting	Blue-print reading	Silversmith	Silk textile	Cotton textile	Automobile	Mathematics	Dressmaking	Millinery	Teacher training
Bridgeport	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
New Britain	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X					X			X
Putnam	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X											X					
South Manchester	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X				X	X		X			X	X	X	X
Torrington	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X					X	X					X			X
Danbury	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X		X		X	X					X			X
Meriden	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X				X	X	X			X	X			X
Stamford	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X				X	X					X			X
New London						X		X			X					X	X					X			
New Haven [2]	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X		X	X	X					X			
Waterbury [2]		X														X	X					X			
Winchester Repeater Arms Co. (N. H.)		X																							

Classes in high schools	Agriculture teacher training	Home economics teacher training
New Milford [2]	X	X
Winsted [2]	X	X
Middletown [2]	X	
Simsbury [2]	X	
Woodbury [2]	X	
Killingly [2]	X	
Thompson [2]	X	
Guilford [2]	X	
Southington [2]	X	
Willimantic [2]	X	
Deep River [2]		X
Ridgefield [2]		X
Putnam		X
Watertown [2]		X
C. A. College	X	X

[1] Taken from Connecticut Trade and Vocational Education; Vocational Bul. I, Series 1922–23.
[2] State aided.

The *division of special education and standards* is charged with the problem of the child who is handicapped mentally and physically. The division was established in September, 1922, and in its first year had organized classes for subnormal children, and open-air classes for those of impaired health. Work had also been instituted for the blind and partially sighted.

The *bureau of tests and investigations*, which conducts scientific studies of schools by means of standard tests, is a part of this division.

The *division of vocational education* is engaged in three main activities, viz, agricultural education, trade and industrial education, and home economics education. The nature and extent of the work of this division is summarized in Table 18.

The *bureau of publications* is charged with editing Connecticut Schools, the monthly publication of the department; with preparing the catalogues of the normal schools and State summer school; and with editing the biennial report of the department.

The *bureau of special investigations* engages chiefly in the task of making local surveys. The department has published several of these investigations.

The principal duties of the *bureau of statistics* are to compile the annual reports of all the towns, prepare the biennial report of the department, assist in local surveys, compile evening school reports, and answer questionnaires calling for school statistics.

The *teachers' certification bureau* is charged with the issuance of teaching certificates. The head of the bureau passes on the merits of all applications except a few unusual cases which are referred to the commissioner. The bureau maintains a placement service, which is more or less informal. No figures are reported on actual placements, and the number of requests from teachers and superintendents is not large.

WORK OF THE SEVERAL DIVISIONS AND BUREAUS OF THE NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The several divisions and bureaus of the New York Department of Education are given in Table 15. The description of the activities of these divisions and bureaus has been so well set forth in a pamphlet entitled, "A Brief Account of the Organization of the University and the Functions of Its Several Divisions" (Albany, 1924), that it need not be repeated here, except for one division. The work of the division of examinations and inspections in administering the "regents system" is distinctive enough to warrant such repetition.

The work of the *division of examinations and inspections*, as suggested by the title, falls into two main parts, the supervision of the examinations and the inspection of the schools of the State. In the

latter phase, inspection by this division is largely confined to the secondary schools, of which there were 1,064 in 1922.

The examinations bureau is—

Charged with the conducting of examinations, the keeping of records, and the issuance of credentials based thereon. Examinations are conducted in the elementary and secondary schools of the State in preliminary and in academic subjects; at designated centers in the State in subjects required for teachers certificates; and at other designated centers in the subjects required for licensure and certification in the several professions under the supervision of the department.

The work of the inspections bureau is carried on by 10 inspectors. Each of these—

is assigned to the group of related subjects in which he is best fitted to represent the department as a specialist both in the field and in the office. In addition to the special assignment, each of these inspectors is allotted one of the several districts into which the State is divided for inspection purposes, and in this territory is held responsible for the general inspection of all secondary schools, professional schools, technical schools, colleges, and universities, in so far as inspection is essential to the enforcement of the special provisions of the education law and of the rules of the board of regents. Under the former particular attention is given to the enforcement of the statutes relating to compulsory education, proper sanitation, and fire protection; violations of these statutes are reported to the division for such action as conditions may render necessary. The rules of the board of regents to which the especial attention of the inspector is directed are those relating to courses of study, standards of instruction, adequate equipment for work, and apportionment of academic moneys. It is further incumbent upon the inspectors to report on conditions relating to general organization, discipline, and instruction in all such institutions, and in all their grades and departments.

WORK OF THE SEVERAL DIVISIONS AND BUREAUS OF THE NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The several divisions and bureaus of the New Jersey Department of Education are listed in Table 16. The description of these divisions and bureaus that follows is quoted from statements prepared for the commissioner of education in New Jersey by the division and bureau heads.

Legal division.—The chief duties of the legal division are to interpret the school code; to arbitrate school disputes involving points of law; to act as a court of appeals on decisions of school boards referred to State department; to determine when State money should be withheld; to advise with local districts in bonding proceedings; to answer correspondence relative to points of law.

Division of secondary education.—The duties of assistant commissioner in charge of secondary education are:

1. Visiting, for the purposes of inspection and conference, 156 public approved high schools and 59 private high schools, as may be necessary.

2. Determining and making an official record of the curricula of each of these public and private high schools.

3. Evaluating and validating all certificates of pupils' work, arising from the transfer of pupils from school to school or from State to State—about 2,500 per year.

4. Investigating individual systems, to help boards of education solve local problems.

5. Attending conferences of teachers of special subjects; such as Latin, mathematics, science, modern language, English, and history. These conferences deal with methods of teaching.

6. Taking part in county institutes, also in city meetings, to discuss methods of instruction and administration. Delivering public addresses.

7. Collecting statistical data, including the annual report. The summarizing, interpreting, and publishing of these facts.

8. Corresponding with schools and individuals within and without the State.

9. Directing the annual State high-school conference.

10. Preparing and editing monographs relative to the content and method of the teaching of the high-school subjects.

Vocational division.—The following phases of work are covered by the vocational division:

1. *Vocational education:* The vocational work includes day and evening schools and classes in trades and industries, home economics, and agriculture. The work done by the division is of three kinds—supervision, inspection, and promotion. Supervision includes assistance given individual teachers in their work, the development of a professional attitude on the part of the teacher and standards as to teaching methods, and shop organization. Inspection includes examination of work of various classes in order to see that they comply with the standards of the State and Federal acts. Promotion includes publicity in regard to the work of the schools, the making of studies and the establishment of cooperative relationships with organizations of employers, employees, farmers, and civic bodies. Periodical conferences are held with various groups of teachers at frequent intervals for the purpose of developing a professional attitude of mind and improving methods of instruction.

2. *Manual training:* This includes the so-called practical arts for boys and household arts for girls, organized under the manual training act. Responsibilities in connection with this work are very similar to those for vocational education, except that the work is less complicated and not so dependent for its success upon the cooperation of outside organizations.

3. *Continuation schools:* The work of the continuation schools includes all-day instruction for employed boys and girls between 14 and 16 years. This work also involves supervision, inspection, and promotion.

4. *Training of vocational teachers:* This includes the training of teachers of trades and industries, home economics, and agriculture. The work in home economics and agriculture is carried on in undergraduate courses at the State agricultural college. So far as this division is concerned, the work has consisted largely of conferences for planning the various courses, inspection of the work being given, and passing upon expenditures made. The work in trades and industries is conducted directly by the State department in late afternoon and evening classes in various parts of the State. This work involves the selection of applicants and their instruction in trade analysis, methods of teaching, etc. Classes are also conducted at the summer school of Rutgers College for vocational teachers, manual training teachers, and continuation school teachers. We plan the work for these classes and assist in conducting it.

5. *Certification of teachers:* All teachers in vocational schools and classes and in manual training classes are passed upon for certification by this department. Visits are made to the teachers' classes for this purpose. The department also cooperates with the office of the State board of examiners in the preparation of examination questions.

6. *Rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry:* This department cooperates with the State rehabilitation commission in the placement and training of persons disabled in industry. This cooperation consists of occasional conferences with the representative of the rehabilitation commission in regard to placement and training and the use of Federal funds for this purpose.

7. *Reports:* Financial, statistical, and narrative reports are prepared annually for the Federal Government on activities pertaining to vocational education and rehabilitation.

Bureau of academic credentials and summer schools.—This bureau covers several fields of activity, namely, academic credentials, State summer schools for teachers, and State teachers' institutes.

Under the first of these titles the bureau has charge of the preliminary qualifying credentials for all the professions, except the teachers' certificates, in which there is the courtesy relationship of adviser to the secretary of the State board of examiners.

Under the State summer schools the bureau has direct control of the State-supported summer schools and advisory supervision of the accredited summer schools in the State.

Extension classes are as yet few in number, but these are under the supervision of the bureau, with the power of approval of the final records.

Teachers' institutes came into the hands of this bureau in 1922. Institutes were held in 16 counties, in 1922–23, all directed from the State department.

Bureau of physical training.—The principal phases of work covered by the bureau of physical training are:

1. Supervision of health activities both as related to medical inspection and corrective physical exercise.
2. Participation in programs of teachers' institutes.
3. Coordination of the physical work of the normal schools, high schools, and elementary schools.
4. Supervision of Trenton Normal School of Physical Training.
5. Promotional activities in cooperation with such agencies as parent-teacher associations.
6. Fostering athletic games and sports.

Teachers' certificates and examinations.—The work of the State board of examiners consists of all detail work required in connection with carrying out, under the direction of the State board of examiners, the provisions of the rules concerning teachers' certificates.

The head of the bureau has direct supervision over all detail work, attends the meetings of the State board of examiners, takes the minutes of the meetings, interviews people who call at the office, reads and answers all correspondence, examines and checks up all credentials submitted by applicants for certification in New Jersey, notifies applicants what examinations, if any, are required, and issues all certificates.

WORK OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS AND THE SEVERAL BUREAUS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION [9]

The Pennsylvania State Department of Education is of especial interest because of its rapid development since 1919. Three master builders have contributed much to the modern conception of a State department of education—Andrew S. Draper, of New York; Calvin Kendall, of New Jersey; and Thomas E. Finegan, of New York and Pennsylvania. The work of Doctor Finegan in Pennsylvania between 1919 and 1923 brought the education department of that State to the front rank. The Pennsylvania Department of Education in 1923 was the last word in modern practice for the simple reason that it was the last department to feel the touch of a master hand.[10]

Deputy superintendents.—The two deputy superintendents are "staff" officers, and as such are not directors of any of the bureaus. The deputy for higher education is charged with coordinating the work of the higher institutions, both in residence and in extension. The deputy for secondary education is also a coordinating officer, and not supervisory or inspectional, as the secondary school expert

[9] Except where otherwise specified, the description of the bureaus in the Pennsylvania department is based on notes of interviews and materials (largely typewritten) gathered at Harrisburg.

[10] Best references on Pennsylvania State department since 1919 are: Finegan, Best Plan for Pennsylvania; Finegan, The State Program in Education; Updegraff and King, Fiscal Policies; Withers, Survey of Pennsylvania State Program in Education. See bibliography.

is apt to be in most departments of education. He depends largely on the work of the subject directors to secure a reasonable degree of standard practice in the high schools of the State.

In addition to the two deputy superintendents, there was in 1923 an assistant to the superintendent, in charge of the legal affairs of the department. He prepared opinions for the superintendent, and advised with local school officers when points of law were involved.

Administration bureau.—The following quotation describes the work of the administration bureau in the language of the man who organized and first directed its activities:

> This bureau has complete charge of the administration of the department. One of its main functions is to relieve the staff of all such detail as might interfere with the effective performance of their professional duties. Acting as a hub around which the whole department revolves, it effects an administrative machinery by means of which all the activities of the department are coordinated, thus making an efficient business office without interfering with the initiative of the several staff members. In other words, it acts as a service bureau handling all mail, incoming and outgoing; is held responsible for all funds appropriated to the department; furnishes all supplies, printing, mimeographing, and multigraphing; and employs all stenographers and clerks.
>
> On the professional side it is held responsible for all such problems in finance and general school administration as may be presented to the department by superintendents and school boards. It gathers, tabulates, and interprets all statistical data—in this way avoiding duplications. It supervises the finances of the 14 State normal schools and acts as a clearing house for sending representatives of the department to speak at public meetings, institutes, etc.[11]

The Pinchot Administrative Code of 1923 placed a number of State boards and institutions under the jurisdiction of the department of education. As a result of this, the administration bureau is now responsible for the budgets of 37 spending agencies.

Americanization bureau.—This bureau is charged with furthering the ideals of American citizenship, chiefly among the foreign-speaking people of the State. Its plan of action calls for cooperation of community agencies, registration and location of illiterates, professional training of teachers and Americanization workers, a state-wide English-first campaign, and a state-wide American citizenship campaign.

Attendance bureau.—The attendance bureau is charged with the enforcement of the compulsory attendance law. Its specific duties are to furnish school registers, census books, and forms for reporting monthly attendance record to the local districts; to inspect and supervise attendance reports from the local school districts. Field agents investigate cases of illegal absence and illegal employment.

---

[11] Fred Engelhardt, Organization of Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction. Amer. Sch. Board Jour., vol. 66, No. 4, p. 48.

Health bureau.—The work of the health bureau is largely promotional, with the view of extending the health service of the schools. Physical education, school nursing, and the teaching of hygiene are the goals that the bureau sets for the schools. The bureau prescribes the course of study for health education in the normal schools of the State.

Preprofessional and professional credentials bureau.—This bureau supervises the issuance of certificates to persons satisfying the educational requirements necessary to begin the study of one of the professions. It is further charged with the issuance of licenses to practice a profession to those persons who have satisfied the legal requirements.

Bureau of rural education.—The bureau of rural education centers its efforts upon the consolidated school movement. Due to its efforts Pennsylvania has secured some good legislation and has made considerable progress in closing one-room schools. The consolidated schools are rigidly inspected by this bureau.[12]

Bureau of school buildings.—The bureau of school buildings supervises plans and specifications for new school projects and sees that plans meet legal requirements, holds conferences for the purpose of reviewing building problems, and preparing a program consistent with both the needs and funds available. The bureau has on file standard plans and specifications for the use of smaller districts. In some instances the bureau prepares preliminary sketches. A valuable service rendered by the bureau has been to conduct a number of building surveys for school districts of the State.

School employees' retirement.—This bureau supervises the provisions of the school employees' retirement act. It keeps the accounts of funds belonging to the retirement system, prepares statements of amounts due retirement fund from local districts, and conducts actuarial studies.

Special education.—This bureau has been assigned the field of supervising the schools in State-aided institutions maintained for the blind and other defective children. The bureau also directs the organization of classes in public schools for the mentally and physically retarded.[13]

Teacher bureau.—The teacher bureau performs three functions, viz, supervision of teacher training, certification of teachers, and teacher placement. The teacher-training work of the normal schools and teacher training for vocational schools are under the direction of this bureau. The standards of the bureau for certification of teachers

[12] The form on which inspection of consolidated schools is reported may be secured from Harrisburg. It is especially good.

[13] F. Engelhardt, op. cit., p. 48.

have a marked influence upon teacher training in the colleges of the State. The bureau performs the important function of evaluating credentials accompanying applications for teachers' certificates and interpreting the rules governing the issuance of such certificates. The placement service of the teacher bureau is the most ambitious one in the five States studied.

Subject directors.—The 11 subject directors are engaged in the following activities: Supervision of a 12-year program in their specialties; preparation of syllabi; participation in school surveys; special calls as consulting experts; institute work; and teaching assignments on summer-school faculties within the State.

Chapter IV

THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF OFFICER

A survey of the organization and functional activity of five State departments of education was given in the preceding chapter. This chapter and the following one will deal more intimately with the professional staff officer as an individual. In the present chapter certain personal facts will be presented, while in the succeeding chapter a picture of the professional officer at work will be given. The material for this chapter was furnished by data secured directly from the five State offices.[1] A total of 133 personnel records were secured, but all of the items were not answered on a number of these blanks. This fact will account for the discrepancies in the totals of the several tables based on the personnel records. The salary data were taken directly from the pay rolls in the five State offices.

The personal facts to be studied are: Method of appointment, qualifications, term, age, education, position held prior to entering State office, tenure in departments of education, and salary.

METHOD OF APPOINTMENT

In Massachusetts, professional staff officers are appointed by the commissioner upon the recommendation of division chiefs. The appointment must be approved by the department of administration, which is a coordinate branch of the State government and wholly outside of the department of education. It is the business of the department of administration to approve virtually all appointments to State offices in Massachusetts, largely on the basis as to whether funds have been appropriated or are available for the position in hand.

In Connecticut, appointment of the professional staff is by joint action of the commissioner and the State board of education. Subordinate members of the department are nominated to the commissioner by divisions heads.

In New York, the professional staff, excepting the assistant commissioners, are governed by the regulations of the civil service commission. The assistant commissioners are appointed by the commissioner, subject to ratification by the regents. All other professional staff officers are appointed from an eligible list of those who have passed qualifying examinations. The successful candidate must stand among the three highest. Positions in the department

[1] In many instances the information was secured directly from staff officers.

are graded according to salary, and advancement from a lower grade to a higher grade is accomplished by passing a "promotion examination." All positions above the lowest grade must be filled from within the department, unless the commissioner certifies to the civil service authorities that no one in the department is qualified for a given position. The commissioner has the privilege of specifying whether or not examinations are open to nonresidents of the State. For the higher positions the examination is waived, and the bases for appointment are the application record, a thesis, and an interview. This gives the commissioner greater latitude in filling the more important positions.

In New Jersey, excepting two bureau heads, professional appointments are made by the commissioner, subject to the approval of the State board of education. The chiefs of the bureaus of academic credentials and teachers' certificates are civil service employees.

In Pennsylvania, the superintendent of public instruction appoints professional staff officers, subject to the approval of the governor and the executive board, which is composed of several department heads of the State government. Prior to the enactment of the Pinchot Administrative Code in 1923, professional appointments were in the hands of the State superintendent absolutely.

QUALIFICATIONS

No fixed qualifications exist for the professional officers in the five departments of education studied. Only in New York are the qualifications very definite. In this State in announcing examinations for vacancies in professional positions the qualifications are set forth in the circular of the civil service commission. The commission usually accepts the recommendations of the education department as to the qualifications necessary for a given position.

Although qualifications are not definitely fixed, except in New York, the professional staff officer, on the whole, is well prepared, both by training and experience, for his job.

TERM

The term of professional staff officers is indefinite in each of the five States, and is dependent upon the pleasure of the appointive power. For those professional officers whose tenure is protected by civil service, as in New York for most positions, and in New Jersey for a few positions, the conditions upon which service may be terminated are definitely fixed.

TABLE 19.—*Age at which 117 professional staff officers entered the service of State departments of education*

Age	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Total
15 to 19	1					1
20 to 24	2	2		1	2	7
25 to 29	6	3	3	1	5	18
30 to 34	7	3	5		14	29
35 to 39	4		1		11	16
40 to 44	3	2	2	3	8	18
45 to 49	4	2	1	2	8	17
50 to 54		1	3	1	4	9
55 to 59						
60 to 64				1	1	2
Total	27	13	15	9	53	117
Median	33.2	32.5	34.5	42.5	37.5	36.0
Rank	4	5	3	1	2	

ENTRANCE AGE

The median age at which men and women enter State departments of education, as shown in Table 19, is 36. Two States have a higher entrance age than the median for the group. In New Jersey the median entrance age is 42.5, while in Pennsylvania it is 37.5. Three States have a lower entrance age than the median for the group. In New York the median entrance age is 34.5, in Massachusetts it is 33.2, and in Connecticut it is 32.5.

Ninety-eight of the 117 persons reporting this information, or 84 per cent of the whole, entered State departments of education between the ages of 25 and 50. Only two of the 117 began their service after the age of 55. Twenty-five, or nearly 50 per cent, of the professional staff in Pennsylvania entered the State education office in the decade from 30 to 40. Seven of the nine reporting from New Jersey entered the Trenton office after 40.

The relatively high age at which men and women are invited to join the staffs of State departments of education indicates a thorough foundation of professional experience for the work of State leadership.

TABLE 20.—*Ages of 122 professional staff officers, April 1, 1923*

Age	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Total
20 to 24	1					1
25 to 29	2				4	6
30 to 34	6	3		1	5	15
35 to 39	6	4	3		15	28
40 to 44	1	1		2	7	11
45 to 49	7		4	2	16	29
50 to 54	4	2	1	3	7	17
55 to 59		2	2		4	8
60 to 64			2		1	3
65 to 69		1				1
70 to 74			3			3
Total	27	13	15	8	59	122
Median	38.75	39.4	52.5	48.75	43.9	44.9
Rank	5	4	1	2	3	

PRESENT AGE

The ages in 1923 of 122 members of the five State departments investigated are given in Table 20. The median age for the group of States is 44.9 years. Two States, New York and New Jersey, are above the group median. In the former the median age is 52.5, while in the latter it is 48.75. Three States, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, fall below the group median. In Pennsylvania the median age of a staff member is 43.9, in Connecticut it is 39.4, and in Massachusetts it is 38.75.

Only seven of the 122 persons reporting their present ages are below 30. New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut report no cases below this age. New York is the only State showing ages beyond 70. One hundred of the 122 cases, or 82 per cent, lie between the ages of 30 and 55.

TABLE 21.—*Margin between entrance age and present age*

State	Median present	Median entrance	Difference
New York	52.5	34.5	18.0
New Jersey	48.75	42.5	6.2
Pennsylvania	43.9	37.5	6.4
Connecticut	39.4	32.5	6.9
Massachusetts	38.75	33.2	5.5

An interesting situation is revealed by Table 21. The difference between the present median age of staff members in State departments and the median entrance age, excepting New York, ranges from 5.5 years in Massachusetts to 6.9 years in Connecticut. In New York the difference is 18 years, giving evidence of what this study shows in a number of places that the staff of the Empire State possesses a permanency and stability that is unique.

TABLE 22.—*Education of 127 professional staff officers in terms of graduation from highest institution attended; college and university graduation expressed in academic degrees*

Degrees	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Total
High school	10		1	2	1	14
Normal school	5		3	2	7	17
A. B	5	8	6	1	7	27
B. S	2		1	0	14	17
Ph. B			1		1	2
B. P. E					1	1
M. E		1				1
A. M	6	2	5	1	13	27
M. S					4	4
Ph. M			1			1
Ll. B			1			1
Ph. D			4	2	6	12
M. D		1		1	1	3
Total	28	12	23	9	55	127

EDUCATION

The education of the members of the five State departments of education is shown in Table 22. Above the normal school, the training is expressed in terms of the highest academic degrees earned in course. Of the 127 staff members giving their education, 75 per cent are college graduates. Of the 14 individuals who did not advance beyond the high school, 10 are found in Massachusetts. Of the 17 who were not trained beyond the normal school, 12 are located in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, seven in the former State and five in the latter. Of the 28 staff members in the Massachusetts office, 15, or 53 per cent, are less than college graduates. Connecticut is the only State among the five to have its professional staff composed wholly of college graduates.

Forty-eight, exactly 50 per cent, of the 96 college graduates, hold the bachelor's as their highest academic degree. The holders of the bachelor's degree number 38 per cent of the 127 reporting on their education. The 32 who have earned the master's degree are 33 per cent of the college graduates and 25 per cent of the total. In other words, one member in every four of the professional staffs of the five States holds, as his highest academic degree, the master's. The 12 who have been awarded the Ph. D. are 12 per cent of the college graduates and a shade under 10 per cent of the total number. One staff member in 10 has earned the doctorate.

The percentage distribution of the education of professional officers, classified as to four ranks of attainment, is shown in Table 23.

TABLE 23.—*Percentage distribution of education*

Attainment	Pennsylvania	New York	Massachusetts	New Jersey	Connecticut
Less than college	15	17	53	44	0
Bachelors	42	39	25	11	75
Masters	30	26	22	11	17
Doctors	13	18	0	34	8

TABLE 24.—*Positions held by 77 professional staff officers prior to entering State departments of education*

Positions	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Total
Teacher (below college)	9	3	6	3	4	25
Principal		2	3	1	8	14
Director special subject					1	1
Assistant district superintendent	1			1	1	3
District superintendent	6	1	9		3	19
Assistant county superintendent					1	1
County superintendent		1		2	5	8
College professor	1	1			4	6
Total	17	8	18	7	27	77

POSITION PRIOR TO ENTERING STATE DEPARTMENT

The positions held by staff members immediately before entering a State department of education are indicated in Table 24.

It will be noticed that 25, or 32 per cent of the 77 cases, entered State education offices directly from teaching positions in public schools. Nineteen, or 24 per cent of the whole, entered from the district superintendency, and 14, or 18 per cent, came in from the principalship. The county superintendency, which exists in only Pennsylvania and New Jersey of the five States, furnished 8, or 10 per cent of the total number. Classifying the 77 cases under two heads—supervisory and teaching—46, or 58 per cent, entered State departments from supervisory positions, while 31, or 42 per cent, entered from teaching positions.

The percentage entering from supervisory positions is distributed as follows among the five States: Pennsylvania, 70; New York, 67; New Jersey, 57; Connecticut, 50; Massachusetts, 41. The percentage entering from teaching positions is: Massachusetts, 59; Connecticut, 50; New Jersey, 43; New York, 33; Pennsylvania, 30. Massachusetts is the only State in which more than 50 per cent of the professional staff of the department of education was recruited directly from the teaching ranks.

TABLE 25.—*Length of tenure of completed service in a given position for 56 professional staff officers*

Years	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Total
0–2.9	3	1	2	2	8
3–5.9	12	2	2	7	23
6–8.9	5		4	2	11
9–11.9	1		2	3	6
12–14.9	1		1		2
15–17.9	1			1	2
18–20.9	1				1
21–23.9	1				1
36–39.9		1			1
42–45.9				1	1
Total	25	4	11	16	56
Median	5.4	4.5	7.1	5.6	5.5
Rank	3	4	1	2	

TENURE

The length of terms of completed service in specific positions is shown in Table 25. Pennsylvania is not included in this table, as the reorganization beginning in 1919 created a number of new staff positions for which this information is not available, as few of the terms had terminated in the spring of 1923. It will be seen that 5.5 years is the median amount of time spent in a given position. This does not mean that this is the median professional life of a staff officer as such, for staff members are frequently transferred to other positions

within the department. New York, with 7.1 years as its median, is the only State to rise above the group median. The median of Connecticut, which falls lowest below the group median, is 4.5 years, only 1 year less than that for the group, showing that there is little variation in this particular. Only 4 of the 56 completed terms recorded were more than 20 years in duration, while 8 ran less than 3 years. It is interesting to note that the range below the median is 5.5 years, while above the median it is 40.9 years.

TABLE 26.—*Length of tenure in present positions of 69 professional staff officers*

Years	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Total
0–2.9	7	4		6	17
3–5.9	11	5	9	3	28
6–8.9	5		1		6
9–11.9	3				3
12–14.9		1	2		3
15–17.9		1	2		3
18–20.9			3		3
24–26.9			1		1
27–29.9			1		1
30–32.9			3		3
33–35.9		1			1
Total	26	12	22	9	69
Median	4.4	4.8	13.5	2.2	4.8
Rank	3	2	1	4	

Table 26 represents tenure in present terms; and as in Table 25 the number of years spent in a given position, and not the total number of years in the State department, is indicated. Pennsylvania does not appear in this table for the same reasons given for its absence from Table 25. The median number of years completed in present positions, in the spring of 1923, was 4.8. This is 0.7 of a year less than the median for completed terms shown in Table 25. As in Table 25, the lower 50 per cent of the range is compact; while the upper 50 per cent is widely scattered, extending from 4.8 years to 35.9 years. New York, with a median of 13.5 years, is far above the group median. The median for Connecticut is identical with that for the group; while Massachusetts and New Jersey fall below the group median. The low median for New Jersey, 2.2 years, is largely due to a number of new appointments in 1921, following the resignation of Commissioner Kendal.

TABLE 27.—*Total length of service in State departments of education for 131 professional staff officers*

Years	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvana	Total
0–2.9	4	3		4	16	27
3–5.9	9	4	5	2	31	51
6–8.9	9	1	2	1	5	18
9–11.9	3	1	1		3	8
12–14.9		2	3		3	8
15–17.9	1	1	2		1	5
18–20.9	1		3	1		5
21–23.9			1			1
24–26.9			1			1
27–29.9			1			1
30–32.9			4	1		5
33–35.9		1				1
Total	27	13	23	9	59	131
Median	6.1	5.6	15.7	3.75	4.3	5.2
Rank	2	3	1	5	4	

The median number of years spent by 131 staff members in the education departments of the five States is 5.2 years, as shown in Table 27. The fact that Pennsylvania, with a large number of recently created staff positions, furnishes 59 of the 131 cases tends to reduce the group median. The median for New York is 15.7 years. Ten of the twenty-three reporting from New York, or 43 per cent, have been in the State department for 18 years or longer. The median for Massachusetts, 6.1 years, is also above the group median, and here again the early establishment of a modern department is reflected. Connecticut, despite a reorganization in 1920, is slightly above the group median. The Pennsylvania median, 4.3 years, is high, considering that many of the staff positions had not been in existence for that length of time when this investigation was made. The relatively low median for New Jersey, 3.75 years, is explained by the infusion of new blood with the advent of a new commissioner in 1921.

The writer was assured in conversation with a number of staff members in the State education offices at the five capitals he visited that the tenure in these positions is good. The great majority of resignations are due to opportunities to enter broader and more remunerative service. Politics, while sometimes affecting the tenure of the chief State education officer, practically leaves the staff members untouched.

TABLE 28.—*Salaries of 256 professional staff officers in State departments of education, 1923*

Salaries	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Total
$12,000			1		1	2
$10,000–$11,999				1		1
$9,000–$9,249	1	1				2
$7,500–$7,749					2	2
$7,000–$7,249			2			2
$6,500–$6,749	1			4	1	6
$6,000–$6,249	1			1	8	10
$5,750–$5,999					1	1
$5,500–$5,749	1		4	1	2	8
$5,000–$5,249	1	3		1	13	18
$4,750–$4,999			1		1	2
$4,500–$4,749		2	3		1	6
$4,250–$4,499			3	1		4
$4,000–$4,249		1	7	2	8	18
$3,750–$3,999	3		5			8
$3,500–$3,749	1	3	6	4	11	25
$3,250–$3,499	5		15			20
$3,000–$3,249	7	3	11		8	29
$2,750–$2,999			8			8
$2,500–$2,749	5		5	1	5	16
$2,250–$2,499	4		7			11
$2,000–$2,249	2	1	13		1	17
$1,750–$1,999	3		13			16
$1,500–$1,749	2		14			16
$1,250–$1,499	1		7			8
Total	38	14	125	16	63	256
Median	$3,071	$3,750	$2,859	$4,500	$4,203	$3,812
Rank	4	3	5	1	2	

TABLE 29.—*Comparison of salaries in certain professional positions, 1923*

[The figures in parentheses indicate the number at salary given]

Position	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania
Commissioner	$9,000	$9,000	$12,000	$10,000	$12,000
Assistant commissioner			(2) 7,000	6,500	(1) 7,500
			(2) 5,500		(1) 6,000
Secondary education	3,750	5,000	[1] 5,500	[1] 6,500	[1] 6,000
Elementary education	3,750	5,000	[1] 5,500	[1] 6,500	
Vocational education	6,000	5,000	5,500	[1] 6,500	5,000
Attendance		3,000	4,000		5,000
School buildings			3,750	3,600	5,000
Rural education		4,500			6,000
Health education	5,000	4,500	5,500	6,000	6,500
Business manager for department	3,240	3,000	[2] 4,500	5,500	[2] 6,000
Subject directors			(7) 3,300		(1) 7,500
			(1) 3,250		(4) 6,000
			(1) 2,750		(1) 5,500
					(1) 5,000
					(1) 4,750
					(2) 4,000

[1] Assistant commissioners.

[2] Director of administration division.

SALARY

Salary data affecting the professional staff officer are presented in Tables 28 and 29. It will be seen from Table 28 that the median salary is good, except in Massachusetts and New York. It is interesting to note that New York, the only State with civil service for its professional staff, pays the lowest salaries.

A comparison of salaries for the more important professional positions is made for the five States in Table 29. Except for several glaring inconsistencies, the salaries are fairly uniform by position.

TABLE 30.—*Salaries of 448 clerical employees in State departments of education, 1923*

Salaries	Massachusetts	Connecticut	New York	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	Total
$3,000–$3,099			1		2	3
$2,700–$2,799				1		1
$2,600–$2,699				1		1
$2,500–$2,599				1		1
$2,400–$2,499					1	1
$2,300–$2,399	1		1			2
$2,200–$2,299		1			1	2
$2,100–$2,199			2	1		3
$1,800–$1,899	1	2	2	2	1	8
$1,700–$1,799		1	1			2
$1,600–$1,699	4	2	7	1	2	16
$1,500–$1,599	1	4	8	1	1	15
$1,400–$1,499	1	3	9	1	1	15
$1,300–$1,399	5	5	6	4		20
$1,200–$1,299	8	3	18	6	31	66
$1,100–$1,199	5	3	11	2		21
$1,000–$1,099	12	3	23	2	2	42
$900–$999	26	3	22	6	38	95
$800–$899	25		20			45
$700–$799	11		40			51
$600–$699	10		29			39
Total	110	30	200	29	80	448
Median	$935	$1,360	$950	$1,275	$1,100	$993
Rank	5	1	4	2	3	

Clerical salaries are presented in Table 30. It will be seen at a glance that they are amazingly low. Only 14 salaries in 448 positions are above $1,800, and three States pay median salaries less than $1,000.

Chapter V

THE STAFF AT WORK

The general activities of professional staff members may be readily classified into office activities and field activities. To be sure, the distribution of time between office activities and field activities varies greatly with staff officers, but all engage in both types of work. Furthermore, there are common types of problems, in the office and in the field, that members of a State education department must meet. In the office no professional staff officer can escape correspondence, callers, telephone calls, reports of one kind and another, preparation of syllabi, bulletins, and other manuscripts, direction of clerical force, supervision of files, and the planning of field work on the basis of office records.

In the field, professional staff members are commonly engaged in inspection of schools, supervision of schools, conferences with school administrators and teachers, speaking engagements, school surveys, attendance at educational conventions, and teaching in State summer schools.

OFFICE WORK

Mail.—The amount of mail, incoming and outgoing, handled by State departments of education is enormous. Two thousand letters a day are received and sent out by the examinations and inspections division in Albany. The teacher bureau of the Pennsylvania State Department has a large volume of mail.[1] In handling large quantities of mail a well-organized routine is highly desirable; and in several State offices, notably Pennsylvania, elaborate standard practice procedure as to correspondence has been developed.

Callers.—The writer, in his visits to the five State offices, was impressed with the relative ease with which the professional staff officers may be reached. True, he was on somewhat of an official mission, but he had the opportunity to observe that these men, for the most part, had no inner office, and anyone was at liberty to walk in. On the whole, so far as the writer could see, the number of callers was not great. There were some exceptions to this general observation. The long bench outside the office of the commissioner of education in Massachusetts was pretty well filled with people waiting to see the commissioner during the whole of three days spent by the writer in the Boston office. In each of the departments visited the State superintendent was the individual most sought. The fact that the legislature was in session in each of these five

[1] A daily average of 881 pieces of mail (Apr. 15 to Sept. 1, 1921). See Fiscal Policies, Updegraff and King, p. 188.

States undoubtedly increased the number of callers wishing to see the chief State education officer. The legal divisions and the school buildings divisions receive a large number of calls from school administrators and directors, as they represent problems not so easily settled at long range. Every schoolman, especially those in administrative work, undoubtedly saves up a number of problems for the occasional trip he makes to the State capital, and then takes his troubles to the education department. Other schoolmen (the writer saw some of this variety), being in the State capital, feel duty bound to drop in for a round of social calls. Most men, in the five State departments visited, seemed quite adept in disposing of this type of visitor. The writer had the opportunity of overhearing a number of conferences between professional staff officers and schoolmen concerning problems back in local districts. In every case the attitude of the representatives of the State department was sympathetic, helpful, and suggestive rather than dictatorial.

Writing activities.—About half of the 76 men and women interviewed by the writer were engaged at the time of the visit in some form of writing. Monthly and annual reports, bulletins of one kind and another, syllabi, and manuals for the help of teachers constitute the sort of writing most commonly done by professional staff officers. The following list of publications of the New Jersey State Department of Education, in the field of elementary and secondary education, gives an idea of one type of bulletin prepared for the aid of teachers:

NEW JERSEY PUBLICATIONS

High School

Manual for High Schools.
Teaching of Plane and Solid Geometry.
Teaching of High-School English.
Teaching of Social Studies, including History.
Course in Physical Training for Grades IX to XII.
Community Civics and Vocational Guidance.
Problems in American Democracy.

Elementary School

Making of School Programs.
Teaching of Elementary Composition and Grammar.
Teaching of Reading.
Teaching of Spelling.
Teaching of Penmanship.
Teaching of Elementary Arithmetic.
Teaching of Geography, History, and Civics.
Course in Physical Training for Grades I to VI.
Course in Physical Training for Grades VII to VIII.
New Jersey Geography, History, and Civics.
Manual for Kindergarten Teachers.
Special Days and their Observance.
Teaching of Music.

Between 1911 and 1923 the Massachusetts State Department of Education published 142 bulletins. The New York State Department publishes four regular bulletins monthly, two issues of The Bulletin to the Schools and two special bulletins. These are in addition to other regular publications, as annual reports, handbooks, and similar material. The fact that the New York office has its own printing plant gives it a tremendous advantage, but even New York has difficulty in keeping up with annual reports. When the writer was in Albany early in April of 1923, one annual report of the State department had recently come from the press, a second was in press, and a third was in manuscript. These reports were for the years 1920, 1921, and 1922, respectively.

Direction of clerical force.—Duties are very definitely assigned to the clerical force in the State education departments of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. When once the clerical work is organized its direction becomes a matter of supervision. Since the amount of clerical help a division may have is dependent upon the amount of appropriation available, most division and bureau directors face the problem of securing maximum efficiency from a clerical force that would be wholly inadequate if not carefully organized. The proof for need of more clerical force is placed upon the director of the division or bureau requesting it. Once organized, the supervision of the clerical force in a given division or bureau may be delegated to a head clerk, so that the office time of the professional staff member need be little occupied with this problem.

Files.—Every bureau and division has its files for the keeping of records and reports. A principle enunciated by Prof. Harlan Updegraff is pertinent at this point—only those records should be kept which are likely to have a future use.[2] In one State office the record of every teacher who served in that Commonwealth since 1837 is on file. In another State department there is a room in which, no matter where one turns his gaze, he is greeted with stacks of attendance record cards serving what purpose Heaven alone knows. As one sees in the offices of State departments of education great rooms whose walls are lined with filing cabinets, the question arises, How much of this vast quantity of material will serve any future purpose?

Harrington Emerson says of records that they should be "immediate, adequate, and reliable." The first of these directly concerns filing. Careful filing makes records immediately available.

Planning field work.—The planning for field work may best be done in the office where the past facts of the case in hand are available. The actual procedure in preparing for a field visit is about as follows:

[2] Lectures on Educational Administration, University of Pennsylvania.

A professional staff member is going out to inspect a given State institution. He will find in the files monthly reports from that institution. He notes that certain items of expenditure are relatively large, or some other detail challenges his attention as being worthy of investigation during the contemplated visit. He may also find in the files records of previous inspection by other members of the staff. He notes their criticism, and this gives him further clues for investigation.

If a public-school system is to be visited, the divisions or bureaus of attendance, law, buildings, elementary education, secondary education, special education, educational measurements, and others can give him, in their files, a comprehensive picture of that school system as it has been viewed from time to time by various members of the State department of education, from several different angles.

This practice of planning visits on the basis of past records tends to make State supervision systematic and effective. Planning of this sort is a legitimate office function which could not very well be delegated to a clerk, as it demands professional knowledge and experience not only to select the most needy cases but to map out a suitable course of action as well.

Examination activities in New York.—New York furnishes a unique type of office work because of the regents' system. In 1922, the 10 subject specialists attached to the examination and inspection division spent a total of 168½ days in preparing question papers for the regents' examinations. In addition, they spent a total of 477½ days in rating student examinations. Twenty-three per cent of the total time of the specialists was devoted to examination work.[3]

FIELD ACTIVITIES

The work of inspection and supervision constitutes the major part of the field activities of most professional staff officers. While there is a fundamental difference between inspection and supervision, yet the two functions are usually carried on simultaneously. Inspection requires that certain items be definitely checked, as, for example, mandatory provisions of the school code. There is no reason why the inspector, at the same time, can not act in a supervisory capacity by encouraging the head of an institution or school system to avail himself of certain features allowable by permissive legislation. The following form used by specialists of the examinations and inspections divisions of the New York State Department of Education illustrates how inspection and supervision are actually combined:

[3] See Table 31, p. 53.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Examinations and Inspections Division

Specialist's General Report

No. ------ Date ---------- Specialist ----------
School ---------- Principal ----------
1. Compliance with statutes or regulations regarding (*a*) compulsory education, (*b*) health and decency, (*c*) fire drill, (*d*) fire escapes, (*e*) flag act, (*f*) physiology, (*g*) physical training, (*h*) maintenance of grade ----------
2. Are the library and apparatus apparently adequate to meet the needs of the school and the requirements of the university? ----------
Are they satisfactorily used? ----------
3. Conference with (*a*) teachers; (*b*) board ----------
4. Summary of conditions (*a*) relating to organization, discipline, and instruction of (1) elementary department, (2) academic department; (*b*) relating to needs in (1) buildings, (2) grounds ----------
Recommendations: ----------

It will be noted in the above report form that item 1 calls for inspection of the mandatory provisions of the school law, while the other items either actually call for supervision or elicit information that may be made the basis for supervision.

No agency has had as long and wide experience in the inspection and supervision of schools as the division of examinations and inspections of the New York State Department of Education. Hence a few glimpses into the internal workings of this division will be both interesting and profitable. For the school year 1921–22 there were 10 specialists attached to this division, for the following subjects: Ancient languages, music, biology, physical science, training classes, drawing, modern languages, English, mathematics, and history. These specialists were engaged in three types of inspection—inspection in their special fields, general inspection, and special inspection. Following is a definition of each of these types of inspection:

Inspection in special fields.—It seeks through the preparation of syllabuses and bulletins to teachers and through examinations to suggest a desirable content in courses of study. It certifies teachers and schools for special purposes. It aims through personal visits to suggest methods by which the teaching of Latin or English, or of mathematics, as the case may be, may be improved. It points the way to ideals of accomplishment, it seeks to correct errors of teaching and to stimulate interest in the field under consideration.

General inspection.—The general inspection considers the organization of the school as a whole, the problem of administration which every principal must

meet, the physical conditions under which the work is done, and the adequacy of library and laboratory equipment for illuminating and reinforcing classroom instruction. It aims above all to make a just appraisal of the character and effectiveness of the teaching and to suggest ways in which this may be improved.

Special inspections.—1. Applications for admission to the university or for advance in grade.

2. Investigations of irregularities in examinations and of violations of law and conduct.

3. Attendance upon contested school meetings or a visit necessary to compare differences which have arisen in a disorganized and disrupted school.[4]

It will be noted that these definitions embrace much that is quite generally understood to be "supervision."

The machinery of inspection in this division is illustrated by the following case: On September 27, 1922, an inspector reported that the program of academic studies in a certain high school was overcrowded. Pupils were allowed to take subjects on half time, and they were permitted to take a fourth-year subject in the second year. Only one-half year of American history was offered. The school stressed cramming for the regents' examinations. Seven of seventeen seniors were rushed through the four years' course in three years. The director of the division sent a letter to each of the following, the school board, the superintendent, and the principal, on October 13, discussing the report of the inspector and stating educational reasons for making the changes recommended.

No reply was received to these letters, and a second inspector was sent to the school directly from the field and without knowledge of the findings of the first inspector. This second inspector independently made a similar report in November. A second letter was sent out by the director, December 20, 1922. A reply was received from the principal December 27 stating that a change in the presidency of the school board had occasioned the delay. A letter from the new president of the board, January 12, 1923, stated that the "short cut" through the high school had been abolished. Filed with the reports and correspondence in this case was a clipping from a local newspaper denouncing the State department for its interference with what was considered, locally, advanced practice in secondary education.

The following report of a visit to a high school in Pennsylvania illustrates the practice in another State:

Report of Inspection

County, Berks_____ Place_____
Date of visit, December 20, 1922_____ Visitor_____

Organization.—8–4 plan; 9 months; 8-period program of 40–45 minutes for each period.

[4] These definitions were taken from the annual report of the division of examination and inspections for 1921–22, consulted by the writer in manuscript.

Faculty.—Consists of three teachers who instruct a total of 96 pupils. Two teachers conduct six recitations per day, and one conducts seven. Normally, an additional teacher is employed for part of the time. After January 1 a principal will be elected, who doubtless will spend a portion of his time in the high school. The three teachers now in the service are college graduates.

Program of studies.—Is that recommended by the department with the exception that no community civics is being taught in the first year, French I and French II are offered, in addition to three years of Latin, and ancient history is taught in the second year and mediæval and modern history in the third year, followed by American history in the fourth year.

Full recommendations were submitted to the faculty concerning the readjustment of the program of studies, together with a list of all other recommendations which will follow.

Building.—Four rooms are available for the accommodation of these classes. Two of them are satisfactory rooms on the second floor of the present substantial building. One of the remaining is a laboratory room in the basement, which in most instances can not be sufficiently heated; and the fourth room is the gymnasium, which is utilized for six periods of the day for recitation purposes. The gymnasium is entirely without blackboard space, without sufficient daylight, and otherwise entirely unsatisfactory for classroom work. A bond issue has been passed for the erection of a new building, which will be started the coming spring. In the meantime it will be necessary for the school to continue in their present quarters, even to the sacrifice of efficient work, but with the hope of rapid progress as soon as the new building can be provided.

Equipment.—The library is practically nil. There is some equipment for the teaching of chemistry and physics, but this is too limited in quantity, and owing to the low temperature of the room it is impossible to be used in many days. There is no equipment whatsoever for the teaching of general science and biology.

Observations.—It is reported that the principal of the high school resigned several weeks ago, and since that time there has been no head over the school. The crowding of the remaining three teachers, and the lack of authority on the part of any one of them, has made the problem of administration a very difficult one during the present interval.

Recommendations.—It is specially recommended that every effort should be made by the board to provide the new building that is planned at the earliest possible date. Every effort should be made to provide the necessary equipment as indicated before, and to reorganize the work in a manner which will enable the school to overcome some of the defects resulting from the present handicaps.

The two report forms below, used in New York, indicate the field activities of the inspectors attached to the attendance division of that State.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Compulsory Attendance Division

Report on Parochial Schools

No_____

1. P. O. _____County_____City_____
or

Town_____Dist. No_____

Name of school_____Denomination_____Date of inspection__

2. Clergyman_____Principal_____
   a. Is clergyman in sympathy with law?_____If not, why?_____
   b. Is he active in having it enforced?_____If not, why?_____
   c. Is he active in not having it enforced?_____Why?_____
3. Attendance officer_____
   a. Is he competent and efficient?_____
   b. How often does he visit this school?_____
4. Have records been carefully kept?_____
   a. Are records inspected by the attendance officer?_____
   b. Are records inspected by local school officers?_____
5. Do teachers of these schools cooperate with public schools?_____If not, why?_____
6. Is the relation between the clergyman and local school authorities cordial? _____If not, state the cause_____
   _____
7. Spirit manifested toward inspector_____
8. Is teaching good or poor?_____
9. Registered: { 7 to 14_____ / 14 to 16_____ } Present { 7 to 14_____ / 14 to 16_____ }
10. Were absent pupils properly accounted for?_____
11. In what way can the department be of assistance to this school?_____
    _____

Give names of pupils absent in violation of law and specific reasons assigned, if any, for such absence. If a parent or guardian has been legally proceeded against, state the fact. If not proceeded against when he should have been, ascertain the reason why and state the same. If the attendance officer has failed to do his duty, did you interview him and what reasons, if any, did he give for such failure? Did you interview members of the board in regard to violation of law in this school? State results of interview.

Answers "Yes" and "No" to printed questions often fail to give sufficient information. When important, give information in detail.

_____, *Inspector.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Compulsory Attendance Division

Report on inspection of public schools

No. _____

1. P. O._____ County_____
   Town_____ Dist. No. _____
2. Date_____
3. Superintendent or principal_____
   a. Is he in sympathy with the law?_____
   b. Is he active in its enforcement?_____
4. President of board_____
   a. Does board actively enforce law?_____
5. Attendance officer_____
   a. How employed_____
   b. Amount of compensation_____
   c. Is he competent and efficient?_____
6. Have records been carefully kept?_____

7. Number of parochial schools_____ Private schools_____
   a. Do teachers of these schools cooperate with public schools?_____
   b. Are their records properly kept?_____
   c. Are these records inspected?_____
8. Have commitments been made?_____
9. Have any parents been arrested?_____
10. *a.* Number of children in district last census___{8 to 14_____ / 14 to 16_____
    b. Number of children registered_____{8 to 14_____ / 14 to 16_____
    c. Number in actual attendance on day of visit_{8 to 14_____ / 14 to 16_____
    d. Were absentees properly accounted for?_____
11. Written report below:

_____

_____

No division or bureau in the five States does a more thorough piece of inspection than the vocational division. One of the simplest forms used is shown below, and this is but suggestive of the close supervision given to institutions operated under the Smith-Hughes Act. The New Jersey form is made out in duplicate. One is left at the school and one is filed at Trenton.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

School_____ Date_____
Teacher_____ Class_____
Number of pupils on roll: 1st yr_____2d yr_____3d yr_____Special_____
Number of pupils present: 1st yr_____2d yr_____3d yr_____Special_____
What jobs are pupils working on?_____
Does the teacher work on the job with the pupil?_____
How is the product disposed of?_____
What is the value of products since opening of term?_____
What steps have been taken to correlate work between shop and class?_____

_____

SHOP INSPECTION RECORD

Is equipment adequate?_____ What additions are necessary?_____
Is equipment clean?_____ In good condition?_____
Is equipment safe?_____ If not, state danger points_____
Are tools adequate?_____ If not, what additions are necessary_____
What methods are used to distribute tools?_____
Is shop clean?_____ Orderly?_____ Well arranged?_____
Is there a course of study?_____ Job analysis?_____
Pupils' progress records?_____
Remarks_____
(Signed) _____

These report forms could be greatly multiplied, but those given are sufficient to show the nature of the work of professional staff officers when engaged in visiting schools.

The following instructions to members of the teacher bureau as to how to proceed when visiting a Pennsylvania normal school is a step in advance of the most exhaustive printed report. It has a philosophy and invites a high degree of initiative on the part of the visitor. At the same time certain definite things are to be observed and objectively rated.

Instructions to members of the teacher bureau in visits to State normal schools

Keep careful notes of all inspections as the basis for a written report at the close of your visit.

Upon arriving at the school, meet the principal and secure an accurate current program. Arrange the details of your visit at once with the principal of the school.

Meet and address the student body in assembly. Meet and confer with the faculty.

Plan your visit according to the following outline:

I. Instruction.

Observe and rate all new teachers.

Observe and rate all questionable teachers. Use teachers' rating score card.

Observe and rate sample student teaching in the training school. Be sure that this sampling is random sampling on an equitable distribution among the groups.

Note the character of the instructional equipment and supplies, including textbooks and illustrative material both in the normal classes and in the training school.

An impression of the student body will be had from three sources:

1. In the assembly.
2. In the several classrooms.
3. In the halls, in the dining room, and on the campus.

In order that this impression may be objective, it should consider the following six points, each of which should be rated high, middle, or low: (*a*) Social status, (*b*) maturity, (*c*) education, (*d*) intelligence, (*e*) personal spirit, (*f*) professional spirit.

There should be a constant expression in the training school of the work of the normal classes, and all courses in the normal school should be taught with a professional viewpoint on the part of the teacher, that is, with a constant recognition of the fact that the students are prospective teachers. Watch for this articulation between the training school and the general flow of instruction, rating it high, middle, or low.

II. Provision for study.

Provision in the classrooms.

Provision in the students' rooms.

Provision in the library.

Time provision for study.

III. Housing.

Eat at the school. Note the character of menus and service.

Note the student living conditions.

IV. Recreation.

Note the physical opportunities for recreation in space, grounds, and equipment.

Note the program opportunities for recreation.

V. Specific Problems.

First semester, 1921–22. Commercial museum materials.

Note carefully special matters raised by the principal and by members of the faculty.

Your primary purpose is to check up the instructional phase of the institutions. Do not give too much time to an examination of the plant and equipment.

Summarizing the work of field inspection and supervision, the same general practice obtains in each of the five States. Members of a bureau or division visit a school. A conference with members of the school board, the superintendent, the principal or teachers, as the case may be, follows. A report, usually on a printed form, is made to the State department. A letter from the head of the bureau or division, or perhaps from the inspector himself, is written in due course to follow up the original missionary work. Subsequent inspections note the glaring defects that have been previously reported, and if no improvement is found the State department keeps hammering away until improvement occurs. Thus does the State, through the principal phase of its field program, bring backward schools in line.

Conferences and other field activities.—Another important field activity of professional staff members is the holding of teachers' conferences. Many significant professional movements are undertaken by groups of teachers and administrators under the direction of members of the State department. The recent elementary and high school manuals of Pennsylvania, the junior high-school manual of Massachusetts, and the high-school manual of Connecticut were all produced by such committees under the supervision of the secondary-school experts in the education departments of those States. The commissioner of education for Massachusetts told the writer that he regarded professional work by groups of schoolmen, under the direction of the State department, as the best avenue for putting over the program of the department in the State.

Members of a State department of education are constantly in demand for addresses. They not only talk to school gatherings but to civic and business organizations as well. Professional staff officers are expected to be able to sell the program of the State department to the people who will have to foot the bill. One assignment of this nature that members of a State department frequently face is the appearance before a legislative committee to justify the appropriation for their division or bureau.

Another activity that takes the professional staff officer out of the office is teaching in summer schools. One-half of the members of the Pennsylvania State Department of Education gave courses in

colleges and normal schools during the summer of 1923. Not only is this a splendid type of service, but it also provides an opportunity to sell the wares of the State department to the teachers in attendance.

Professional staff officers of a State department of education should be leaders of national repute, and as such are expected to attend various educational conventions. The convention of the local State teachers' association and the two meetings of the National Education Association are regular events on the calendar of many professional staff officers. In fact these men frequently occupy places on the programs of these meetings.

Reporting activities of staff officers.—Before closing the discussion of the professional staff at work, a further amplification of the reporting activities will serve to give a more comprehensive picture of the general activities of members of State departments, and to emphasize the extent to which their time is accounted for. On every side the professional staff officer is hedged with reports. If he is in the field, he must leave in the office a weekly schedule of his visits. His report of visits has been touched upon quite fully. He must make out an itemized expense account, in accordance with definite regulations. In New York, maximum living expenses are set for the various cities of the State. Then, in addition to the reports of visits, a monthly report is required showing how his time has been spent. New Jersey even requires an accounting by hours for each day of the month.

Samples of the weekly schedule cards and forms on which to report expense accounts may be secured from State offices upon request. The New York expense account form is especially interesting, as it shows how closely this matter may be checked.

Activities as reflected by monthly reports.—The following monthly reports give further intimate glimpses into the activities, both office and field, of members of State departments of education. These are actual copies from the files of the States visited by the writer.

Massachusetts—Monthly Report—Bureau of Secondary Education, April, 1922

CONTENTS:

1. *Junior–Senior High School Conference.* Conference of principals, 3 days. Koos, Calvin, Kingsley on program.

2. *Senior High School Manual.* Drafted by committee of 11 principals and supervisor of secondary education.

3. *Junior High School Circular.* Popular and condensed form of junior high school manual for school committees and citizens.

4. *High School Buildings.* Conferred with 9 superintendents on new High School (Junior and Senior) Buildings.

5. *Speaking Engagements.* Six.

6. *Visits.* Two, as result of one visit a conference with superintendent and school committee planned on "the needs of the school." Principal has not grasped "idea of making the high school meet the needs of all the children."

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Division of Elementary Education

Monthly Work Report

Month: *February.* Year: *1923*

Date	Place	Purpose	Hours of travel	Hours of time, actual	Is report filed?
Feb. 1	Bordentown	Inspection	2	7	Yes.
Feb. 2	Stirling	do	4	6	Yes.
Feb. 3	Newark	Conference	2	6	Yes.
Feb. 5	Rutherford	Inspection	3	6	Yes.
Feb. 6	Englewood	do	3	8	Yes.
Feb. 7	Camden	do	4	8	Yes.
Feb. 8	Trenton	Office		8	Yes.
Feb. 9	do	Conference	1	9	Yes.
Feb. 10	New York	do	2	6	Yes.
Feb. 12	Morris Plains	Dedication	3	3	Yes.
Feb. 13	Somerville	Inspection	5	8	Yes.
Feb. 14	Freehold	do	1	10	Yes.
Feb. 15	W. N. Y.	do	4	8	Yes.
Feb 16	Camden	Conference	4	7	Yes.
Feb. 17	Newark	do	3	7	Yes.
Feb. 19	Trenton	do		9	Yes.
Feb. 20	Hackensack	Inspection	3	7	Yes.
Feb. 21	Long Branch	do	3	4	Yes.
Feb. 22	Trenton	Office	3	2	Yes.
Feb. 23	Woodbridge	Conference	4	6	Yes.
Feb. 24	Trenton	Office		3	Yes.
Feb. 25	Cleveland	N. E. A.		Full day.	
Feb. 26	do	do		Full day.	
Feb. 27	do	do		Full day.	
Feb. 28	do	do		Full day.	

Distribution of time between office and field.—The equitable distribution of the time of staff members between the office and the field is a constant problem for departments of education. How this distribution was actually made by the 10 specialists attached to the New York division of examinations and inspections for the year 1921–22 is shown in Table 31.

TABLE 31.—*Summary of inspectional activities, school year 1921–22, division of examinations and inspections, New York*

Name and subject	Inspections, special field	General inspections	Special inspections	Number days rating papers	Number days preparing question papers	Number days survey work	Number days correspondence and office work	Number days teachers conferences and educational meetings	Number days miscellaneous
Ancient languages, Doctor Arms	63	72	24	18½	28½	2½	35½	14	17½
Music, Mr. Carter	187	------	------	25	2	------	90	21	------
Biology, Mr. Clement	44	77	2	64	22	------	48	13	4
Physical science, Doctor Cobb	20	39	43	56	12	2	87	17	5
Training classes, Mr. Johnson	53	61	7	59	18	------	56	25	12
Drawing, Miss Knapp	77	------	15	45	5	------	30	17	------
Modern languages, Doctor Price	116	------	14	40	30	------	50	15	35
English, Mr. Richards	74	22	20	60	2	4	70	22	4
Mathematics, Mr. Seymour	71	21	8	56	37	------	54	16	5
History, Mr. Smith	107	30	2	54	12	------	27	24	35
Total	812	322	135	477½	168½	8½	547½	184	117½

It is evident that the professional staff officer is an exceedingly busy individual. His time is filled to the brim with the activities of his position. He is on the job more continuously than any other education officer, as in most instances a two weeks' vacation is the only break in the year's work. His compensation for this strenuous program is that he is not harassed by parents and the general public, as are classroom teachers and public-school administrators. The activities of the staff officer are based on a well-organized routine, and his effectiveness depends upon how generously he is provided with expense allowance for field work.

Chapter VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study of the professional staff of State Departments of Education in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania is intended to supplement the several monographs dealing with the State board of education and the State superintendent of schools. It is confined to a selected group of States, each in a relatively high stage of development as regards organization and functional activity, that an intensive study might be made by personal investigation at the five State capitals.

The setting for the study is a survey of the rise of the professional staff since 1900. This survey is presented in Chapter II, and reveals that the general practice of assigning specific tasks to specialists has come since 1910, and, for the most part, since 1915. The development of the staff has not been uniform in the States, and in a number of departments the practice is still to assign a group of important functions to one officer. While the degree of specialization varies, it is safe to conclude that the principle of functional specialization, by professional staff officers, is generally accepted and actually practiced by State departments of education.

The findings in the main body of the study hold only for the group of five States investigated. While this is true, the fact that the professional staff in these States is engaged in virtually every activity to be found in departments of education in the country at large makes it quite likely that the picture of the professional staff officer presented in this summary is typical for the 48 States. The varied practice of the five States seems to strengthen the validity of this assumption.

THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF OFFICER

Appointment.—In Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey, the commissioner recommends the appointments of professional staff officers and the State board of education confirms them. In New York the same method applies to the assistant commissioners. This practice is in accord with the recommendations of Cubberley and Claxton.[1] In New York, professional staff officers below the assistant commissioner are appointed in accordance with the regulations of the civil service commission. In Pennsylvania the State superintendent nominates to the governor and the executive board, which is composed of several department heads of the State government.

[1] Cubberley, State and County Educational Reorganization, p. 26. Claxton, Bul. 46, 1920, U. S. Bu. of Educ., p. 6.

This practice is bad, in that it is an unnecessary check upon the independence of the department of education.

Qualifications.—Qualifications are not definitely stated, except in New York. In this State the rules of the civil service commission require that qualifications be specified on the announcement of the examination for a given position. Claxton says that professional staff officers "should be chosen from the country at large on the basis of fitness." [2] As far as Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania are concerned, they are chosen on the basis of fitness, but there is little disposition to go outside of the State.

Term.—The term of the professional staff officer, except in New York, is indefinite and is dependent upon the pleasure of the appointive power. In New York, because of the protection of civil service, the tenure is virtually permanent.

Age.—The median age at which 117 professional officers entered the service of State departments of education was 36. The range, by States, was from 32.5 in Connecticut to 42.5 in New Jersey. The median present age of 122 professional staff officers in 1923 was 44.9. The range, by States, was from 38.75 in Massachusetts to 52.5 in New York. The margin between present age and entrance age is 18 years in New York, and for the other States varies from 5.5 years in Massachusetts, to 6.9 years in Connecticut.[3]

Cary says, as to the training of professional staff officers, "They should certainly be equal in every essential respect to the men who serve as professors of education in our best universities." He further contends that from one-fourth to one-third of the professional members in a State department should hold the Ph. D. in Education.[4] New Jersey most nearly approaches this ideal, with two doctors of philosophy in a total of nine professional officers. It is interesting to note that, in the group of five States, Connecticut alone has a professional staff composed wholly of college graduates.

Position held prior to entering department of education.—Of the 77 reporting on the position held before entering the department of education, 58 per cent were engaged in supervisory positions and 42 per cent in teaching positions. Those drawn from supervisory positions classify as follows: City or town superintendents of schools, 22; supervising principals, 14; county superintendents, 9. Of those drawn from teaching positions, 6 were college professors and 25 taught in institutions below collegiate grade. Massachusetts is the only State to recruit more than half of its professional staff directly from the teaching ranks.[5] The great majority of professional positions in State education offices demand experience in educational

[2] Bul. 46, 1920, U. S. Bu. Educ., p. 6.
[3] See Tables 19, 20, and 21, pp. 33, 33, 34, respectively
[4] School and Society, vol. 11, p. 342.
[5] See Table 24.

administration and supervision. The apprenticeship should be served before entering the State department.

Tenure.—Information was secured on 56 cases of completed tenure. The median term was 5.5 years. The range, by States, was from 4.5 years in Connecticut to 7.1 years in New York.

The median for the term in present positions for 69 cases in 1923 was 4.8 years. The range, by States, was from 2.2 years in New Jersey to 13.5 years in New York.

Professional officers are frequently promoted, within the department, so that the term in present position does not indicate the number of years spent in the State department. The median of total service for 131 cases is 5.2 years. The range, by States, for total service is from 3.75 years in New Jersey to 15.7 years in New York.[6]

The tenure in professional positions of State education departments is relatively good as compared with other administrative positions in education such as city school superintendencies and college presidencies.

Salaries.—The median professional salary paid by the five States in 1923, and based on the whole number of professional employees (256) for that year, was $3,812. The median salary for each State was: New Jersey, $4,500; Pennsylvania, $4,203; Connecticut, $3,750; Massachusetts, $3,071; New York, $2,859.[7] Salaries for the same type of position vary from State to State, but this is to be expected in the very nature of things. The most striking variation is in the salaries paid subject specialists in New York and the subject directors in Pennsylvania.[8]

Clerical salaries are much less than professional salaries. The group median for the total of 448 clerical employees in 1923 was $993. The median clerical salary, by States, was: Connecticut, $1,360; New Jersey, $1,275; Pennsylvania, $1,100; New York, $950; Massachusetts, $935.[9]

What should professional salaries in a State education office be? Cary says the minimum for women should be $2,500 and the minimum for men $3,000. The maximum "should be sufficiently high to secure men of great enthusiasm and energy, with the best modern training, and with splendid social qualities." [10] Updegraff, writing on the salaries paid the professional staff in Pennsylvania, states, "the salaries are no higher than is necessary to secure and hold men and women of the high qualifications that such positions demand in order to promote the highest efficiency in the schools of the State." [11]

---

[6] See Tables 25, 26, 27, pp. 36, 37, 38, respectively.
[7] See Table 28.
[8] See Table 29 for the variations.
[9] See Table 30.
[10] School and Society, vol. 11, p. 342.
[11] Fiscal Policies, p. 179.

THE STAFF AT WORK—OFFICE AND FIELD ACTIVITIES [12]

The principal tasks that engage the time of the professional staff member in the office are: Correspondence, reception of callers, writing activities, supervision of files, and planning for field work. The regents' system in New York adds examination work to the list of office activities for certain of the specialists in the State.

In addition to the primary function of supervising and inspecting schools, field duties include holding conferences, making addresses, attending educational conventions, and teaching in summer schools.[13]

The distribution of a staff member's time between office and field work is a problem that State superintendents must meet. We have seen that 10 specialists in New York, avowedly field men, spent 52 per cent of their time in the field. Is that sufficient? On this score, one educational expert says, field workers should spend at least three-fourths of their time out in the State while the schools are in session.[14]

CONCLUSION

The basic problem facing State departments of education is effective organization of the professional staff for field service. State departments appear quite equal to the task of absorbing increased detail arising principally from greater responsibility as State subsidies for education become larger. In the clamor for larger appropriations sight must not be lost of the need for more effective field work. The State has a duty to itself and to the taxpayer to assist local districts in the wise expenditure of public money.

Each State has its own peculiar needs. At the same time, the New York plan for field service, with appropriate modifications, should be applicable in any situation. A professional staff, to render the most effective service at reasonable cost, should be composed of experts, with both specific and general training. A vocational specialist, a modern language specialist, an attendance specialist, or what not, should be able to size up a general school situation as well as render assistance in the field of his specialty. Such a staff can cover more territory, both geographically and professionally, than one comprised wholly of specialists in specific fields or of general specialists.

No problem is more vital to the equalization of educational opportunity in the American States than the work of the professional staff officer. No agency less than the State can achieve this equalization, and the greatest single factor in a program of equalization is the personal service of the State performed by the members of the professional staff of the department of education.

---

[12] Only the briefest summary will be given to "the staff at work." The reader is referred to Chapter V in its entirety for this subject.

[13] See Updegraff and King, Fiscal Policies, pp. 186–198, for detailed statement of field activities of Pennsylvania State Department.

[14] Cary: School and Society, Vol. II, p. 341.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

The following is a list of the publications of the five State departments collected by the author during his investigation:

Connecticut

A course of study in civics. Louise Schmahl. 1917.
A manual of physical education for elementary grades, 1922.
Attendance agents; a study of their activities, 1919.
Connecticut history stories. Daniel Howard. 1920.
Connecticut schools. (Official monthly publication of State Board of Education.) Vols. 4 and 5. 1922 and 1923.
Directions for testing hearing, 1922.
Education directory. School document no. 1, 1923.
Educational inquiry. Glastonbury, 1916.
Educational inquiry. New Hartford, 1916.
Educational inquiry. Newtown, 1915–16.
Eyesight test, 1922.
High-school directory, 1922–23.
Laws relating to schools. School document no. 3, 1920.
Organization and administration of high schools in the State of Connecticut, 1921.
Plans for progress for use in elementary schools, 1920.
Professional library; books available for teachers, 1919.
Professional reading list, 1916.
Report of Connecticut Board of Education, 1920.
Rules and regulations concerning State teachers' certificates, 1922.
School and community field days, 1923.
Spring activities in relation to physical education and health, 1922.
Syllabus in elementary agriculture, 1922.
The children of the State, are they where they should be? 1919.
Trade and vocational education. Vocational bulletin 1, 1923.

Massachusetts

Administration of Independent Day household arts schools. Bulletin no. 9, 1918.
Administration of State-aided practical art classes for women, Bulletin no. 7, 1922.
Administrative forms used in the establishment and administration of State-aided vocational and continuation schools. Bulletin no. 11, 1921.
Annual report of Board of Free Public Library Commissioners for the year ending November 30, 1921.
Annual report of the Division of the Blind for the year ending November 30, 1921.
Annual report of the Division of Immigration and Americanization for year ending November 30, 1921.
Annual report of Teachers' Retirement Board for the year ending December 31, 1921.

Budget recommendations to the General Court of Massachusetts, January 19, 1923.

Commission service in Massachusetts. Board of Free Library Commissioners, 1921.

A description of the work of the library commission.

Courses offered for correspondence and class instruction. Division of University Extension, 1923.

Educational directory, 1922–23.

Eighty-fourth annual report of Department of Education, 1919–20.

Eighty-fifth annual report of Department of Education, 1920–21.

General laws relating to education, 1921.

Information relating to the establishment and administration of county agricultural schools and agricultural departments. Bulletin no. 23, 1916.

Information relating to the establishment and administration of State-aided vocational schools. Bulletin no. 22, 1916.

Manual for junior high schools, 1923.

Plans of Massachusetts for year 1919–20. Board for Vocational Education. Bulletin no. 4, 1919.

Report of the Commission on Immigration—The problem of immigration in Massachusetts, 1914.

Seventh annual report of Division of University Extension, March, 1922.

Sixth annual report of Division of University Extension, March, 1921.

Statistics of the public schools for the year 1921–22. Boston, 1923.

The teachers' retirement system. Teachers' Retirement Board. Bulletin no. 3, 1922.

New Jersey [1]

Annual report of vocational education, 1920.

Directory of vocational schools, 1920–21.

Education bulletin. (Official monthly publication of department.) Vols. 8, 9, 10. 1921, 1922, 1923.

New Jersey school directory, 1922–23.

New Jersey school report, 1921.

Rules concerning teachers' certificates, 1920.

School building survey, 1922.

School laws, 1921.

Survey of accounting and business systems of the school districts in New Jersey, November, 1921.

New York

A brief account of the organization of the university and the functions of its several divisions, January, 1924.

Bulletin to the schools. (Official semimonthly publication of the department.) Vols. 9 and 10. 1922 and 1923.

Child welfare and compulsory education bureaus. Census. Report, 1918.

Compulsory education and child labor laws. Bulletin 728, 1921.

Full text of laws with annotations, department rulings, and legal forms for use of school authorities and employers of minors.

Courses for vocational teachers. Summer session. Oswego, 1923.

Education law, 1922.

Educational measurements; a selected bibliography. J. C. Morrison. 1921.

Organization and institutions, October, 1922. (New York education directory.)

[1] See pp. 94 and 95 for list of further publications of N. J. State Dept. of Educ.

Program of dedication exercises, State education building, 1912.
Contains brief history of the university, together with a brief description of the work of its several divisions.
Regents rules, 1919.
Regents rules, changes in. (Published in leaflet form from 1919 to January, 1923.)
Regulations relating to teachers' certificates, November, 1922.
Report of Division of Vocational and Extension Education for the year ending July 31, 1921. 1923.
Report on higher education for school year ending July 31, 1919. 1922.
Report on secondary education for the school year ending July 31, 1919. 1922.
Rules and regulations regarding the preparation and audit of accounts payable from State funds (rules concerning traveling expenses). January, 1921.
Spelling in New York rural schools. J. C. Morrison. 1922.
Syllabus in history, 1922.
The University of the State of New York, the State Department of Education. Circular of information for distribution at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, 1915.
The University of the State of New York, the State Department of Education. Descriptive circular, 1916.

Pennsylvania

A digest of the laws controlling school attendance and employment of minors, 1922.
Arbor Day and Bird Day, 1923.
Certification of teachers, 1922.
Classification of high schools, 1921–22.
Courses of study in agriculture, 1923.
Courses of study in commercial education, 1923.
Courses of study for continuation schools, 1923.
Course of study in foreign languages, 1923.
Course of study in geography, 1923.
Course of study in mathematics, 1923.
Course of study in music, 1923.
Course of study in social sciences, 1923.
Hospital intern year. Bulletin no. 15, January, 1922.
Library manual for high schools, 1922.
Manual and syllabuses for elementary schools, 1922.
Manual for high schools, 1922.
Medical education and licensure. Bulletin no. 12, January, 1922.
Medical education and licensure; drugless therapy, physio-therapy, chiropody. Bulletin no. 14, January, 1922.
Medical education and licensure, midwifery. Bulletin no. 16, January, 1923.
Our army of illiterates. Thomas E. Finegan. 1921.
Part-time cooperative industrial education, 1923. (Mimeographed.)
Pennsylvania School Journal. Vols. 49–51 (1921–1923).
Legally the official organ of the Department of Public Instruction, but published by State Educational Association.
Preprofessional credentials, November, 1922.
Proceedings of Second Educational Congress, 1920.
Public school directory, 1922–23.
Report of Conference on Foremanship Training, 1922. (Mimeographed.)

Report of the superintendent of public instruction, 1919.
School law, 1921.
Digest of 1923 school legislation. (Mimeographed.)
Vocational agricultural education, 1923. (Mimeographed.)

SECONDARY SOURCES

Alexander, Carter. The Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction under Cary. School and Society, 14: 529–44.

Bobbitt, J. F. Lay versus expert control. School Review, 22: 52–54, 1914.

Butler, Nicholas Murray. Problems of educational administration. Educational Review, 32: 515–24.

Cary, Charles P. How a State department may stimulate local initiative. In National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1918, p. 506. (Discussion by G. D. Strayer.)

——— Our educational advance in the State. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1911, p. 210–15.

——— The making of a State department of public instruction. School and Society, 11: 336–43, 1920.

Claxton, P. P. Organization of State departments of education. *In* U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1920, no. 46. (Introduction.)

Connecticut Education Commission Report. *In* Connecticut State Board of Education. Report, 1907–9, p. 50–63.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. Changing conceptions of education. New York, 1909.

——— Desirable reorganizations in American education. School and Society, 2: 397–402, 1915.

——— State and county educational reorganization. New York, 1914.

Diemer, Hugo. Factory organization and administration. New York, 1910.
Chapter IV discusses staff and departmental organization.

Draper, Andrew S. The limits of State control in education. Educational Review, 1: 26–32, 1891.

Duncan, John C. The principles of industrial management. New York, 1911.
Chapter 13 discusses types of organization.

Engelhardt, Fred. The organization of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction. American School Board Journal, 66: 48, April, 1923.

Fairchild, Edward T. The province of State boards and State superintendents in the administration of public education. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1909, p. 423–26.

Finegan, Thomas, E. Functions of the State in local administration. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1916, p. 348–51.

——— The best plan for Pennsylvania. Ninth Annual Schoolmen's Week, University of Pennsylvania. Proceedings, 1922.

——— The State program in education. School and Society, 14: 61–65, 1921.

——— Uniformity of standards in school administration. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1913, p. 122–31.

Gilman, D. C. Education in America, 1776–1876. North American Review, 122: 191–228, 1876.

Hart, J. K. Decentralization in education. Survey, 47: 53–54.

Higbee, E. E. How a State superintendent can best advance popular education. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1884.

Holland, Bernard. Central and local government. Edinburgh Review, 237: 41–58.
Good on England's experience with extreme centralization in education.

Humphreys, Willard C. Government and education in the United States. Columbia College, Ph. D. thesis.

Illinois Education Commission. Report. Springfield, Ill., The Illinois State Journal Co., State printers, 1909.

Joyner, J. Y. How a State department may stimulate local initiative. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1918, p. 507. Discussion by G. D. Strayer.

Kalbach, L. A., *and* Neal, A. O. Organization of State departments of education. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1920, no. 46.

Kirk, John R. The province of State educational institutions in the administration of public education. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, p. 433–34. Discussion by W. O. Thompson.

MacDowell, Theodore L. State versus local control of elementary education. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1915, no. 22.

Miller Frank W. Problems that confront the State superintendent in his relation to rural schools. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1914, p. 251–53.

Monohan, A. C. Organization of State departments of education. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1915, no. 5.

——— *and* Cook, Katherine M. Report of an inquiry into the administration and support of the Colorado school system. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1917, no. 5.

——— Educational survey of Wyoming. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1916, no. 29. Part 4 contains a good discussion of organization of State departments.

Moyer, James A. University extension in Massachusetts. Journal of the National Education Association, 11: 405–07.

Reeder, Ward G. Selecting the chief State school official. American School Board Journal, 66: 37–39.

——— The qualifications of the chief State school official. American School Board Journal, 67: 39–40.

——— The salary of the chief State school official. American School Board Journal, 67: 41–42, 138.

Seerley, Homer H. The province of the common people in the administration of public education. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1909, p. 415–21.

Sisson, Edward O. The State department and educational statesmanship. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1915, p. 511–15.

Smith, Payson. Limitations of State control in education. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1918, p. 490–93.

Strayer, G. D. How a State department may stimulate local initiative and increase efficiency. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1918, p. 501–04.

——— *and* Engelhardt, N. L. The classroom teacher at work in American Schools. New York, 1920.

Sutton, William S. Discussion of address by Homer H. Seerley. The province of the common people in the administration of public education. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1909, p. 421–23.

Thompson, W. O. The province of State educational institutions in the administration of public education. *In* National Education Association. Proceedings and addresses, 1909, p. 430–33.

Updegraff, Harland, *and* King, Leroy A. A survey of the fiscal policies of the State of Pennsylvania in the field of education. Chapter 5, p. 170–194. Philadelphia, Department of Public Instruction, 1922.

Weber, A. W. State control of instruction: A study of centralization in public education. Cleveland, Ohio, 1914.

Webster, W. C. Recent centralizing tendencies in State educational administration. New York, 1897.

Withers, John W., *and others.* Survey of the Pennsylvania State program of education. Pennsylvania School Journal, March 12, 1923. (Special edition.)

○